

Mr. TOWNER: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 9270. A bill to confer upon the territorial courts of Porto Rico concurrent jurisdiction with the United States courts of that district of all offenses under the national prohibition act, and all acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 12019. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; without amendment (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6204. A bill to grant the military target range of Lincoln County, Okla., to the city of Chandler, Okla., and reserving the right to use for military and aviation purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 12019) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 12020) to define a period in which certain claims may be presented for determination to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for refund of taxes erroneously collected from certain estates of decedents under color of section 29 of the act of Congress approved June 13, 1898, entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," and amendments; and to authorize payment of amounts allowed in the determination of such claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12021) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 12022) relative to the naturalization and citizenship of married women; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 12023) providing for an additional appropriation for eradication of citrus canker in Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATTERSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12024) granting a pension to Mary J. Replogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12025) for the relief of Henry Shull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12026) granting a pension to Alexander Surrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12027) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Logan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12028) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Thorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 12029) granting a pension to Florence A. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 12030) granting a pension to T. J. Cage; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5996. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition signed by the principal and teachers of the Roosevelt School of Toledo, Ohio, protesting against intrusting the Armenians to Turkish rule; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5997. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for release of political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5998. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Labor, Washington, D. C., Edward Keating, manager, relative to the recent wage decisions of the United States Railroad Labor Board; to the Committee on Labor.

5999. Also, petition of Republican Interstate League, Washington, D. C., urging the enactment of the antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6000. By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Petition of 342 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 9753, introduced by Mr. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6001. By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Central Labor Union of Philadelphia, asking recognition of Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 15, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1922.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the tariff bill will be temporarily laid aside, and the Chair lays before the Senate the naval appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11228) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|           |                |            |              |
|-----------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| Ball      | Gooding        | McKinley   | Sheppard     |
| Borah     | Harris         | McNary     | Shortridge   |
| Bursum    | Hefin          | Nelson     | Simmons      |
| Calder    | Hitchcock      | Newberry   | Smoot        |
| Cameron   | Johnson        | Nicholson  | Sterling     |
| Capper    | Jones, N. Mex. | Norbeck    | Swanson      |
| Culberson | Jones, Wash.   | Oddie      | Trammell     |
| Curtis    | Kellogg        | Overman    | Underwood    |
| Dial      | Kendrick       | Pepper     | Wadsworth    |
| Edge      | Keyes          | Phipps     | Walsh, Mass. |
| Elkins    | King           | Pittman    | Walsh, Mont. |
| Ernst     | Lenroot        | Poindexter | Watson, Ind. |
| Fernald   | Lodge          | Pomerene   | Willis       |
| Gerry     | McCormick      | Rawson     |              |

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is absent by reason of illness.

Mr. HARRIS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. WATSON of Georgia] is detained by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in connection with the naval appropriation bill which has just been laid before the Senate there was a report submitted. The report was printed some days ago and sets out the most important changes recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in the bill as it passed the House. I do not care to take the time of the Senate in making a speech upon the bill or any feature of it at this time. I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed first to the consideration of the committee amendments. When they are disposed of the bill will then be subject to any amendments that may be proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KING. Does that mean that there is to be no reading of the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not mention whether there should be a reading of the bill or not, but unless there is some reason for reading the bill at length, I would much prefer to dispense with its formal reading. I shall be very glad, indeed, to stop at any point in the bill which any Senator desires to have specially considered and take such time as may be necessary for the reading of any provision as to which that may be required.

Mr. KING. I shall not insist upon the formal reading of the bill, with the understanding that we may pause as the reading progresses, and such explanations may be asked for and given as Senators may desire.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is the desire of the committee to have the fullest consideration of any disputed feature of the bill. I shall be very glad to cooperate with the Senator from Utah to that effect.

Mr. President, there are just one or two remarks I would like to make in regard to the bill in explanation of the general status of the matters covered by it. Senators will remember that there was quite a discussion, more or less prolonged, upon the question of personnel. The House committee reported the bill to the House of Representatives providing for a personnel of 67,000 enlisted men, of which 2,000 were to be apprentices. After a very extended debate in the House of Representatives that number was increased by action of the House to 86,000 enlisted men.

While there were some members of the committee who regretted that a larger personnel was not provided for, in view of all the conditions surrounding the Navy at this time, it was decided not to recommend any change in the provisions of the bill as to personnel as it passed the House of Representatives, and the bill contains no changes in that respect.

However, since the bill passed the House of Representatives Congress has enacted a law making some changes in the pay both of the enlisted and commissioned personnel of the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, all the commissioned services of the Government. That has become a law, having been approved by the President. Of course whatever force we retain in the Navy will have to be paid in accordance with the provisions of that law.

I emphasize again, to those who have not had occasion to follow the matter, that that law has been enacted since the Navy appropriation bill passed the House of Representatives. Consequently it became necessary to readjust the amount of the appropriation carried in the bill for pay of the Navy, and also for provisions of the Navy to some extent, to make it correspond with the basis provided in the law to which I have just referred. That constitutes a total of approximately \$20,000,000 net increase in the appropriations carried in the bill and the chief item of increase in the appropriations, about which of course I can not see that there can be any dispute after there is an agreement as to the personnel, because it is a matter of law.

We have added an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for carrying on the work which is now in process upon the new ships of the Navy which have been under construction for several years. They include 4 battleships, 10 scout cruisers, 42 submarines, a few destroyers, and some auxiliary vessels. These are the ships left in the complement of the United States Navy under the terms of the recent naval limitation treaty entered into between the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy.

The committee believed it to be demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt that it was in the interest of economy, as long as we are to complete the program as to certain of the ships to which I have referred, to carry on the work steadily rather than to close down the plants and allowing the organization to be separated and then having to start up again. Such a course as that would be extravagant; and it would be an inefficient manner of proceeding. So we believe that the comparatively moderate increase of \$10,000,000 on account of what is technically called an increase of the Navy—that is, to carry on work upon ships under construction—is in the interest of economy.

There is one other increase that is made in the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The Senator has alluded to an increase of \$10,000,000 which is carried in the bill for naval construction. May I inquire whether that is for the construction of submarines, airplane carriers, or capital ships other than airplane carriers?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It includes all the purposes which the Senator from Utah has mentioned.

Mr. KING. Is any other part of the appropriation of several hundred million dollars to be devoted to the completion of vessels which are now upon the ways or for the construction or repair of vessels?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator mean for the construction and repair of vessels that are already in commission?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; there is another appropriation in the bill for the construction and repair of vessels that are already in commission.

Mr. KING. Then the appropriation for \$10,000,000 is for new construction solely?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is for the construction of new ships; it is called "for the increase of the Navy."

Mr. KING. Take, for instance, the *West Virginia*, which, I presume, will be retained; will that be completed out of this appropriation of \$10,000,000?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Work will be carried on upon the *West Virginia* from a fund provided in the bill, some of which was carried in the bill as it passed the House, and which will include the \$10,000,000 if that sum is added to it. Work will be carried on upon the *West Virginia* and upon the other ships to which the Senator from Utah has referred from that fund.

Mr. KING. May I inquire, though perhaps the inquiry is not quite germane to the point to which I am now directing attention, whether the appropriation carried in the last naval appropriation bill has been exhausted?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; it has not, and that is the reason that only the sum of \$10,000,000 is appropriated in this bill. There was no new appropriation whatever in the bill as it passed the other House for new construction, but simply a re-appropriation of the unexpended balance of the fund to which the Senator from Utah refers.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that the last naval appropriation bill carried ninety-odd million dollars for construction. How much of that will be available on the 1st of July next?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The sum of \$44,385,000 will then be available.

Mr. KING. Then about 50 per cent of last year's appropriations will have been expended on the 1st of July?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. KING. What becomes of the \$44,000,000 which has not been expended?

Mr. POINDEXTER. A reply to the Senator's question would involve quite an extended detailed statement. The Senator will find printed in the concluding pages of the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the pending bill a statement showing just how much of the unexpended balance will be expended upon each ship and upon each class of ships. It will be used upon 42 submarines, 3 battleships, 10 scout cruisers, and 2 airplane carriers to be converted from battle cruisers which were to be eliminated or converted in accordance with the terms of the arms limitation treaty.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Washington refers to that part of the report on the pending bill which is found on pages 7, 8, and 9?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. President, there is one other item that I may mention, and then I think there will be set clearly before the Senate the important recommendations of the committee reporting this bill.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,500,000 for new aircraft. There was nothing carried in the bill as it passed the other House for new aircraft. However, in the report of the House committee to the House it was stated that, in the opinion of that committee, some \$7,000,000 would be required for the construction of new aircraft, and some \$500,000 for the construction of hangars and other appurtenances at aircraft stations; but the House made no appropriations for those purposes. In view of the conceded importance of the Air Service in naval warfare, as shown by the experience of other nations and by demonstrations and tests that have been carried on in this country, the committee regarded it as of vital importance that the United States should not altogether stop the construction of aircraft and the maintenance of an Air Service in the Navy. Consequently we have added an appropriation of \$6,500,000 for new aircraft and \$300,000 for construction at stations, which means the construction of buildings which are necessary to the maintenance, operation, and repair of the new aircraft to be constructed.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I was informed on yesterday that under this bill an effort was made to eliminate from the Air Service, I think, 50 commissioned officers. Is that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator refer to the bill as it passed the House of Representatives?

Mr. POMERENE. No; I refer to the bill as it is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The bill as reported by the Senate committee has just the opposite effect of that, as compared with the bill as it came to the Senate from the House. Instead of eliminating 50 temporary officers in the Aviation Service, it provides for retaining in the service that number of commissioned officers.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, possibly I may have misunderstood my informant. Do I understand now from what

the Senator has said that the House bill would have relieved 50 of those officers from duty?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The House bill would have relieved from duty a great many more than that, or, more correctly speaking, would not have prevented their separation from the service, because they would have been separated from the service under existing law unless some new provision was made for them.

Mr. POMERENE. Let me ask the Senator further, so that my understanding may be clear about this question, if I am justified in inferring from what the Senator has said that under the pending bill the Air Service connected with the Navy Department will continue as it now is?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; not strictly speaking; but it will continue as it now is, with the exception that under the existing law some of the temporary aviation officers will be separated from the service by limitation of time on the 1st of July. That is what the law now provides entirely separate and apart from this bill.

Mr. POMERENE. How many of them?

Mr. POINDEXTER. In the neighborhood of 83.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Perhaps I can enlighten the Senator from Ohio, because, as the Senator from Washington will recall, I had something to do with the hearings before the subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee on this subject.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to complete the statement I was making, in order that the Senator from Ohio, if I may make myself clear, may get a correct idea of the matter?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In the neighborhood of 83 aviation officers failed in the examinations which were given them some time ago, and, having failed, they would be separated from the service by the expiration of time and the limitations of existing law on the 1st of July. We recommend in this bill that an opportunity be given to not exceeding 50 of those officers to be reexamined.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask for a reference to the page of the bill which contains that provision to which the Senator has alluded?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is on page 35.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is at the bottom of page 35 of the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield the floor.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask a question in regard to the procedure here?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand that the formal reading of the bill has been dispensed with and that it is to be read for committee amendments?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that we are to proceed to take up the committee amendments as they are reached in the reading of the bill. In the colloquy on the floor, while there was no formal agreement on the subject, it was tentatively understood that the reading of the entire bill was dispensed with, unless some Senator should ask that some portion of it in which he was interested be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Washington to request unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with; that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered. Is there objection?

Mr. BORAH. I have no objection to that procedure, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, at a later time I will explain in detail the situation in connection with the aviation service of the Navy as to which the Senator from Ohio has asked. I understand, however, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] desires to take the floor, and I will not take the time to discuss the matter at present. I yield the floor to the Senator from North Carolina.

#### THE TARIFF.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to interfere with the naval appropriation bill which is now before the Senate, but I gave notice on yesterday evening that, while I could not then speak because of the lateness of the hour, I desired at the first opportunity to make some remarks in reply

to the very remarkable speech delivered on yesterday by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with reference to the tariff bill.

The Senator from North Dakota delivered a speech yesterday which divides itself naturally and logically into two parts: First, an explanation, or an attempted explanation, of the criticisms and assaults upon his bill by the Republican press, especially the great metropolitan Republican newspapers; and, secondly, an argument in favor of his bill based upon the spread between the invoice or landing cost of the foreign article and the retail selling price of that article in the American market. I think an examination of the bill will show that such was its objective, and that as an explanation on the one hand of the newspaper opposition to his bill, and an argument on the other hand in favor of the rates in the bill, the Senator's effort was wholly inadequate and must have been a dismal disappointment to those who sympathized with his purposes.

Mr. President, I wish as briefly as I possibly can to analyze the Senator's several contentions; and first let me direct my attention to his defense of his bill from the assaults that have been made upon it by the newspapers and the general public. It is well known that heretofore, in the discussion of tariff measures, very little attention has been paid to the specific schedules in the bill. The discussions have centered around the fundamental differences with respect to the tariff principles of the two great political parties, the difference between what the Republicans termed low tariff or free trade, as advocated by the Democrats, and high tariff or protection, as advocated by the Republican Party.

I have had to do with many tariff bills, and I have discovered how little light such general discussions have thrown upon these measures that are of such vital importance to the people. I therefore determined, Mr. President, as the minority member of the committee responsible for the management of this bill upon the floor of the Senate, that I would see to it that this bill had a thorough discussion, not only of a general character, not only of an academic character, but a discussion in detail of the paragraphs and the items and the schedules, to the end that the press of the country and the people of the United States might be advised as to the extent of the taxes imposed and the reasons of their imposition, that they might intelligently pass judgment upon whether the circumstances and facts of the particular case justified the tax. So for the first time in the history of tariff making in this country we began a detailed discussion of every item as it was reached, presenting the facts and the figures touching the particular article taxed, and exposing the injustice of the tax in case the facts did not in our opinion warrant the duty imposed.

When we first began that discussion, the other side of the Chamber refused to respond, and let it be understood that having the votes to pass this measure they did not care to participate in the discussion of the items. It was with difficulty that we secured from them responses to inquiries for information, but we were not disheartened. We pressed on with the discussion, we made exposure after exposure, and as a result in a short time we began to reach the public with our facts and arguments against these rates. Then we began to reach the press of the country. As never before, the public began to discuss these tariff rates, while certain great metropolitan papers that had always stood for protection, that had always been orthodox in their Republicanism, began to take interest in these daily discussions and to investigate these rates. They soon saw that the bill was not a protective measure at all, that its rates did not square with any principle of protection that had ever been advocated in this country by the champions of protection or that had ever been declared by Republican conventions as the basis of rates. They began to see that instead of being a tariff for protection it was a tariff to maintain existing exorbitant profits and prices of the products of the protected industries; that it was not only a tariff for the purpose of maintaining those profits but it was a tariff which afforded an opportunity further to advance those profits to the point of further profiteering without danger of competition from abroad. As a result, Mr. President, a great metropolitan paper of the Middle West, always staunch in its Republicanism and adherence to the theory of a protective tariff, unable to square this bill with that theory and with the welfare of the American people, came out in a great editorial denouncing the measure. I refer to the Chicago Tribune, a paper of as large circulation, as I understand, as any paper in the Middle West. The Chicago Tribune declared the bill to be iniquitous; it declared that it ought never to pass in the form in which it was then presented. That was followed by a great editorial in the New York Journal of Commerce, another great Republican

paper, upon the same lines, making substantially the same arguments that we had been making here upon the floor of the Senate against these items, one after another.

Mr. President, I took occasion to read these editorials into the Record and to comment upon them, and at the same time to express the hope that other great newspapers in this country, irrespective of party, would follow these discussions and make independent investigations of these rates, and discharge their duty to the public by exposing this bill and these rates if in their judgment, after these investigations, they thought it proper to do so. As a result, other papers—I shall not recount them now, but later I shall refer to them again—other great newspapers in this country representing the Republican Party, and Democratic and independent papers as well, not only in the great metropolis of the country but in the smaller towns of the country, speaking as Republican organs, speaking as independent organs, speaking as nonpartisan and as commercial papers, came out in denunciation of the measure; whereupon the chairman of the Finance Committee, becoming alarmed at the effect of these assaults upon his bill, felt the necessity of making some answer, felt the necessity of making some explanation, in the hope of breaking the force of this volume of opposition and protest from the press which was meeting a ready response from the people of the United States, including many lifelong and staunch Republicans and protectionists.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator to allow me to interrupt him to cite the fact that at least one important commercial body, the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Lincoln, Nebr., a Republican stronghold, formally met, and the retail section of that chamber of commerce adopted resolutions protesting against the passage of the bill, and those resolutions were formally transmitted to the Senators and Representatives from Nebraska by the Chamber of Commerce of Lincoln, a city which is overwhelmingly a Republican center. I have been informed that other representative bodies of that sort, representing the business interests of the community, have held similar meetings of protest.

Mr. SIMMONS. I recall that the Senator did present the resolutions to which he refers, adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Lincoln, Nebr.

The Senator from North Dakota, in charge of this bill, under the impulsion of necessity, from his standpoint, took occasion to make a violent assault upon the Republican newspapers from which I had read. He charged that they were influenced to make their attacks upon his bill because of the advertising patronage which they receive from the department stores and the importers, of course charging, by that, that the commercial opponents of this bill were confined to the department stores and the importers. He attempted to account for their opposition upon the ground that these great journals were moved in their opposition by the advertising subsidy they were charged with receiving from those sources. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] asked the Senator from North Dakota if he meant to say that these importers and these department stores could have purchased the support of these great newspapers with cash, and he declined to answer, but let his charge stand.

When the Senator in his first speech attempted in this way to account for the assaults of the two papers—the only ones I had quoted at the time of his defense—I countered by quoting not one or two but a half dozen or more additional papers, some of them Republican and some of them independent papers. A few days thereafter I supplemented that list by presenting to the Senate articles from nearly a score of papers published in different parts of the country, some of them farm papers, some of them commercial papers, some of them nonpartisan papers, one of them, I think, a religious paper, and others independent papers, and to this good day he has persisted in the contention that the motive he assigned accounted for this opposition to his bill on the part of these great newspapers.

Yesterday he repeated his former charge and devoted much of his speech to renewed denunciation of these papers and these alleged sinister influences charged with influencing their action in this behalf.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator, if he objects, but I have before me an editorial from the Ohio State Journal, a Republican paper, of June 3, 1922, bearing upon this subject. I will not introduce it now, unless the Senator desires me to present it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will not the Senator from Ohio let me set him right? He will remember that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] read that paper out of the Republican Party the other day.

Mr. POMERENE. I know it has been independent at times, but the editor and publisher of the paper contributed liberally to the Republican campaign fund in Ohio in 1920.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the New York papers, such as the Journal of Commerce, the Globe, the Daily News Record of New York, the New York Tribune, and the New York Herald, five great Republican papers in that city, five of the leading papers of the greatest metropolis on earth, can be influenced to oppose a measure of this kind, promulgated by the party in charge of the Government, a measure claimed to be in the interest of general prosperity; if they can be purchased by the advertising of two relatively small classes of interests, then indeed has the press of America sunk to a low level; then indeed are the vital interests of the American people, whose palladium of liberty and freedom is largely an untrammelled and an honest press, in jeopardy.

These are all great papers. They are supposed to be highly prosperous and to be backed by adequate finances. They are published in the metropolis of the world, so to speak, where the press is supposed to be free from the local and partisan influences which may obtain in small communities. The country at large is in the habit of looking to the great metropolitan press for a fair, honest, impartial expression of opinion with reference to public questions, and yet the chairman of the Finance Committee would have the country believe that five of the great Republican papers of the metropolis of the country can be purchased, their columns and their editorials, with advertisements.

When it was shown, as it has been shown, that the opposition is not confined to the press of the metropolis or to the great importing centers, but is widely distributed, the Senator persists in the charge that the baneful influence of the department stores and the importer upon the newspapers of the country, perverting the channels of information upon which the people are wont to rely for aid to solve the great public questions which confront them, accounts for the opposition to this bill, which has assumed threatening proportions in the ranks of his own party.

Mr. President, I can not conceive of anything more far-fetched than that. Even if the opposition were confined to the newspapers published in the immediate vicinity of the importing metropolis, or in the immediate vicinity of the department stores, I can not understand the argument, and I can not understand why the chairman of the Finance Committee should be willing to present to the American people such an argument as that in explanation of these assaults upon the bill. It seems not only inadequate but, if I may say it without discourtesy, trifling and frivolous.

Mr. President, are the importers the chief advertisers of the country? Indeed, are they large newspaper advertisers at all? If we take up the great newspapers of New York or of Chicago or of Philadelphia or of Baltimore, I venture the assertion that we will find in them very little advertising by the importers. The great advertisers are not the importers. The great advertisers are the men who make the special articles, the great industrial combinations and corporations, many of which have received such specially favorable consideration and treatment in the bill. They are the greatest newspaper advertisers. Many of them are in favor of the bill and want it passed.

But is it conceivable that these great newspapers with these two classes of advertisers, one the importer doing a small amount of advertising as compared with the other doing a large amount of advertising, in order to serve the smaller advertising patron would deliberately antagonize the larger and more profitable one?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I rather deplore the apparent admission of the Senator from North Carolina that it would be possible under any circumstances for any set of advertisers to control the papers of New York or any other city.

Mr. SIMMONS. Why, Mr. President, nothing could be further from my thought than admitting it. I said "if" it could be done.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from North Carolina would be justified in condemning the arguments of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] as childish and provincial and entirely out of date. If there is one thing fairly established in the newspaper world to-day it is that advertising is placed upon the strictest business principle. There is not an advertiser of any importance who does not buy his publicity at the cheapest price at which he can get it. There is not one of them who spends a dollar if he can avoid spending it. Of the millions of dollars invested every year in advertising in the newspapers

of New York City, practically every dollar is put into the newspaper advertising upon the most cold-blooded business principle. There is not an advertiser who goes into a paper by reason of favor and I doubt whether one one-hundredth part of 1 per cent of the advertising in New York City is a matter of favor.

Merchants do their advertising because they have to reach the public. They buy their advertising space as they buy the goods they sell, upon the lowest possible market and to get the greatest amount of publicity for the least amount of money. Any paper in New York, probably every paper in New York, rejects thousands of dollars of advertising a year and declines to accept it. I repeat, the money of the advertiser that goes into the newspapers nowadays goes in because the merchant is compelled to do it to get publicity, and the day has gone when advertising is placed by favor.

I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that during the last generation advertising has developed into a science. The great merchants of New York employ men at high salaries to find how they can get the largest amount of advertising, the largest amount of publicity, for the least amount of money, and they figure down to the very one-hundredth part of a cent how much an inch of space costs per thousand of circulation, and they buy that inch. They buy it not because they want to favor the paper, but because they must have the publicity to run their business. So this talk about advertising being placed by favor is not only an unjustified charge against the New York newspapers and against the newspapers of any city, but it is an idiotic charge, Mr. President.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question about newspapers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No man would make such a statement who understood anything about advertising in this day and age.

Mr. BURSUM. Does the Senator from Nebraska believe that the newspapers of the metropolitan cities, such as New York, are more patriotic than the newspapers of the State of Michigan?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; no more than the people of New York are more patriotic than the people of the State of Michigan.

Mr. BURSUM. Then, how does the Senator from Nebraska reconcile the attitude on his side of the Chamber—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am not going to yield for a political argument.

Mr. BURSUM. When the charge was made on the floor of the Senate that by reason of extensive advertising by Mr. Newberry in the newspapers of the State of Michigan the press was controlled and influenced.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have never made such a charge.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I will not yield further for this political argument.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor and declines to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will permit the Senator from Nebraska to conclude his statement, but I decline to yield for a political argument.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not want to detract at all from what the Senator from North Carolina has said. He is absolutely correct in condemning the ridiculous charge made by the Senator from North Dakota. All I wanted to say is that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has betrayed his absolute ignorance of modern business methods when he argues that advertisement is placed by favor. A merchant would be an idiot to advertise by favor. What he is doing is to advertise for business, and he is placing his advertising where he can get the most publicity and circulation for the least possible money.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, what I tried to say and what I think I did say in substance was that the special articles which are put upon the market by the protected industries of the country and which find a ready and universal sale by reason of general advertisement are not advertised by the retailer, but by the producer. I might illustrate that by the American Tobacco Co. and the Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co. The retailers who sell their products do not do the advertising of those products. The producers and manufacturers advertise throughout the country, making the brands popular, and thereby stimulating business and the demand for their products in the different localities of the country.

They and not the importers are the great advertisers. If the newspapers had to choose between the small advertiser and the large advertiser, they would undoubtedly not choose so as to offend the large patron in the interest of the smaller patron, was the statement I made, and, of course, that is true.

Again, Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota thinks that the opposition to the bill not attributable to the influence of the importers over the newspapers is due to the influence of

the advertising patronage of the great department stores. He violently assaults these stores. He referred to them, as I recall it, as octopuses working much havoc and wreckage to the business welfare. Finally, as I recall it, in the heat of argument he compared them to the trusts. He puts the department stores in the same evil category as the trusts.

Mr. President, the trusts of the country are outlawed because they tend to stifle competition and arbitrarily establish prices. They are the subject of animadversion for that reason. But the department stores, which the Senator from North Dakota so bitterly denounced, do not suppress competition. On the contrary they are one of the greatest agencies in the country in the regulation of competition to the end of keeping down prices. They are popular with the people and almost continuously are putting on reduced price sales at which they must sell on small profit margins and which encourage and promote competition. Their prices and profits, while, of course, large in some instances, are relatively small. The reduced prices of the department stores, news of which is carried over the country in their advertisements, have their effect, too, upon the prices in stores in the smaller cities and towns. In the cities the competition among the department stores themselves is generally real and very sharp.

Department stores, therefore, instead of operating against the interest of the consumers of this country, operate in their interest through the regulation of prices. I will admit that during the World War the department stores, together with everybody else, went wild upon the subject of high prices, and that to a certain extent prices are still far too high; but I submit that the general influence of the department stores has not been against the public welfare; has not added to the burdens of the consumer but has been a restraining influence upon unbridled profiteering.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota proceeded throughout his argument upon the theory that the department stores were practically the only importers. Nothing could be further from the mark than that. He claimed that they were the chief beneficiaries of the high retail prices which the Senator called to the attention of the Senate on yesterday and denounced. As a matter of fact, the department stores are not large importers and their prices are lower than the average retailer. Some of them are not importers at all. A representative of Marshall Field & Co. came to my office a few days ago and discussed this subject with me, and he made the statement—and I believe it is true—that 90 per cent of the goods and wares carried in the department stores which are controlled and owned by Marshall Field & Co. are produced in the United States and that this was the average percentage. He stated that 10 per cent of their goods were of foreign origin, but that a larger part of that 10 per cent was composed of articles which were not produced in this country at all, and that the greater portion of the remainder consisted of foreign novelties and fancy designs which the trade demanded. I imagine this is true of many, if not of most, of the department stores.

It is necessary for these great establishments to keep a full line of goods. Unlike the ordinary big stores, their line of goods has to include everything, for they advertise to the people that they sell practically every article of merchandise sold in the American market. If an article is not produced in this country, they must go abroad and get it. If it is produced in this country, but not according to the design that is most attractive and popular to the consumer, they must go abroad for it.

The department stores, I repeat, are not great importers.

Who are our greatest importers? They are our great manufacturing industries. Many of them are large importers of raw materials; some import practically all their raw materials. If Senators will take the statistics and examine them, they will find that the bulk of our imports are materials which are for use in manufacturing. For instance, take silk. We are one of the greatest silk-manufacturing countries in the world; yet we do not produce raw silk. Practically every pound of raw silk converted in this country—and we manufacture sufficient to supply our domestic demand, which is very great—comes from the Orient. I might go on down the line and further demonstrate the fact that the department stores are relatively small importers.

The Senator from North Dakota in his assault upon the department stores has no basis or justification in fact; he predicated his assault upon a fictitious situation. The importers are not more interested in the defeat of this bill than the average business which is not a special beneficiary of its gratuities. I think, as the Senator from Nebraska has stated,

it is absolutely silly to assign such reasons as those which I have discussed as the cause of the general uprising of the newspapers against the pending measure. Mr. President, this uprising is not confined to the newspapers. The Senator from North Dakota seems to think that it is confined to the newspapers. It extends to the people, irrespective of party. Why, bless my soul, it is not partisan but, indeed, bipartisan, so to speak.

It is only necessary to mix with Republicans to ascertain how obnoxious this measure is to many of them, how they regard it as violative of every principle of protection for which their party has heretofore stood. The Senator from North Dakota has offered no sufficient or even plausible reason for this Republican opposition to his bill, and the answer he makes as to the newspapers' opposition is vain and futile.

The Senator does not like the editorials criticizing and condemning his bill I have from time to time read to the Senate; but at the risk of further offending I wish to now read a few more, and I now ask to put in the RECORD certain additional editorials bearing out my statement as to the general uprising against this bill and to further enlighten the Senator from North Dakota with reference to the widespread character of this hostility. First, I will read an editorial from the Chicago Daily News—not the Chicago Tribune, a Republican paper which the Senator thinks was subsidized by advertisements, but the Chicago Daily News—an independent newspaper, which speaks as follows:

Protectionist newspapers, stanchly Republican in politics, are almost daily directing attention to the excessive and extortionate duties in the pending bill. General business sentiment is hostile to it—

General business sentiment, Mr. President; the Senator from North Dakota thinks that nobody is hostile to it except the newspapers which have been bribed (?) by advertising patronage, but the Chicago Daily News, published in the great Middle West, says:

General business sentiment is hostile to it and hopes it will not be passed. In such circumstances the suggestion of cloture—

This editorial is dated May 27—

the suggestion of cloture is stupid and untimely.

Listen, Mr. President—

More light on the jokers and anachronisms of the bill is urgently needed.

We have given light day after day, but the opposition has been trying to becloud and smother that light.

Thus far its opponents have rendered the public valuable service. They are to be commended for their patient studies of obscure—

And listen again, Mr. President—

of obscure and tricky provisions that unpleasantly suggest the notorious Schedule K of the Aldrich tariff.

Mr. BORAH. What is the Senator reading from?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am reading from the Chicago Daily News, an independent newspaper, denouncing this measure, declaring that the general business sentiment of the country is hostile to it, declaring that it is full of "jokers" and anachronisms, that it ought not to pass, and that the Democrats and the other opponents of the bill have rendered the public a service in exposing it, especially its obscure and tricky provisions.

Now, I want to read another article from the New York Tribune. This article was written after the Senator from North Dakota had denounced the Chicago Tribune and the New York Journal of Commerce for "selling out" to the department stores and the importers.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Chicago Daily News will serve very well to illustrate the point made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] a few minutes ago. That paper is not required to accommodate its editorial policy to the desires of any class of advertisers. I have no doubt the fact is, as the Senator from North Carolina has stated, that its patronage from domestic producers is very much larger than its patronage from either the department stores or the importers; but it is not obliged to accommodate its editorial policy to the desires of any class of advertisers. It is one of the great, profitable newspaper enterprises of the country, and it is not obliged to court any kind of advertising. It is always overwhelmed with applications for space in its columns.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think these other great newspapers are obliged to court advertising, either. They are highly prosperous and are able to be independent.

Now I want to read from the New York Tribune. Mr. President, is there any paper published in the United States whose Republicanism is less subject to criticism or question than that

of the New York Tribune? Down in my country it has always been regarded as the very impersonation of extreme Republicanism and extreme protectionism, though it is a very great paper, one of long life and one of great prosperity. I do not believe that the New York Tribune could be bought by the advertisements that a department store would give or by the little advertisements that it could get from the importers of New York. In fact, I think the Senator from North Dakota would search that paper in vain to find an importer's advertisement. I imagine that they are not doing much advertising now. I do not think they ever have done much advertising. I never have seen much importers' advertising matter in the papers.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? A man who is making that much profit does not need to advertise?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is true, if he makes as much as the Senator from North Dakota contends.

Mr. CARAWAY. But I was going to suggest that the Senator from North Dakota picks out the Tribune and accuses it of willfully misrepresenting the facts about shoes and says that when it was set right it would not publish the correction.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; well, I am going to read what this paper says, anyhow, Mr. President:

A tariff bill is not the sort of bill which should be railroaded through Congress. It affects a vast variety of individuals and group interests. It touches nearly every citizen. The more open and exhaustive the discussion on it the better—if the discussion is honest. Not even Mr. McCUMBER claims that the Senate measure is error proof or that it should be taken as anything but a guess at what the country needs in the way of protection.

A tariff bill at this session would be a gift of little value to the party or the country. A steam-rollered bill would be a challenge to party discount and public indignation. (New York Tribune (Rep.), May 29, 1922.)

Mr. President, I want to read now an editorial from a paper published in Akron, Ohio. I do not know whether there are any great department stores in Akron, and I do not know anything about this newspaper. It is the Akron Times. I am told that it is an independent paper. I assume that it is honestly edited and that it is above bribery through advertising. If the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], who sits before me, can throw any light upon it before I read, I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. POMERENE. It is a very high-class paper.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I suppose the Senator from North Dakota would have difficulty in showing that there was any immediate connection between this paper and the department stores or the importers.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator for a question, but I am not going to enter into any argument or controversy.

Mr. WILLIS. I simply want to ask a question of my colleague, if the Senator from North Carolina will permit me. I want to ask my colleague whether he indorses the view expressed by the Senator from North Carolina that the Akron Times is an independent paper.

Mr. POMERENE. I did not answer that question. I think it is a Democratic paper.

Mr. WILLIS. That is my understanding. It is a high-class Democratic paper.

Mr. POMERENE. It is a very high-class paper. I think Democrats and Republicans alike concede that.

Mr. SIMMONS. It was given to me as an independent paper, and I will read what it says, for both Ohio Senators admit it is a high-class paper:

Demands from the majority Senators that debate upon the McCumber tariff bill be squashed after but four weeks' consideration must appear somewhat arbitrary, in view of the fact that the majority Members have been over three years producing the bill and that the bulky tome already has more than 2,000 separate amendments.

From the mere standpoint of party strategy it might be a wise thing for the minority to submit and permit the bill to go on its way undisputed.

And undoubtedly it would be if we were taking only a partisan view of it.

It would be a policy of giving the opposition calf rope to hang itself. But the bill threatens the industrial welfare of the Nation too seriously to be tacitly tolerated, and its passage or defeat becomes a question involving much more than mere party advantage or disadvantage.

The tariff question to-day is one that reaches above and below mere partisan politics. It is a question which involves not only the prosperity of our own country but the good will of the world. The present bill is nothing less than criminal in its stupidity.

Mr. President, I ask permission to insert without reading—because I have not had an opportunity to read it, and it is

rather long—an editorial just handed me by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] from the Ohio State Journal, which, I understand from the statement of the Senator from Ohio, criticizes this bill very severely. Does the Senator know of any influences on the part of department stores and importers that might overcome the scruples of this journal and cause it to depart from the course its judgment might dictate with reference to this question?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I do not think anybody would presume to charge that that paper could be influenced editorially through its advertising columns.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

(From the Ohio State Journal of Saturday, June 3, 1922.)

DODGING THE QUESTION.

One of Senator McCUMBER's arguments for the tariff bill is that the many Republican newspapers which oppose that ill-timed, and we trust ill-starred, measure, and the number of them includes nearly all the more important and influential ones, are Democratic newspapers in disguise. Another is that the newspapers are all under department-store influence anyway, from which we gather, not having known it before, that the department stores are supposed to be actively opposing the McCumber-Fordney bill.

These fancies of the hard-pressed Senator are of course no arguments for the enactment of a foolish and harmful law, nor would they be even if they were facts. When a man publicly points out the error of some course you are bent upon, it is no answer at all to say that he is a sneak or an unworthy tool of somebody else, even if that were true. The only question which it is up to you to answer is, Is what he says true? If you dodge that question and begin to abuse him, thoughtful people see at once that you are pretty shaky in your mind about the defensibility of your own position. We have not seen any report of an attempt on Senator McCUMBER's part to prove the incorrectness of the arguments of the newspapers which he accuses of masquerading and subservience.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish now to read from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a Republican paper which at present, I understand, has independent leanings. Heretofore it has been a consistent Republican paper.

All it (protection) should attempt to accomplish—  
Says this paper—

is to establish equitable conditions of competition giving the American producer and manufacturer a fair opportunity. When it goes beyond that it operates to throttle commerce and to oppress the American consumers. The present tariff bill, we are convinced, goes far beyond this standard of protection, and in seeking to help industry will inevitably work injury to it. This bill has not been constructed with due regard to the public welfare, and it ought not to be passed in its present form.

Now, I want to read from the Chicago Tribune an editorial that has not heretofore appeared in the RECORD, and it ought to go in the RECORD. This editorial says:

The tariff makers are working on exactly the old logrolling methods which have been operative for decades. One man, desiring a high tariff on a certain commodity, regardless of its effect upon the country as a whole, agrees with another man desiring a high tariff on another commodity, regardless of its effect upon the public, that each will support the other's demands. They do so, the tariff is fixed on these two commodities, and the public interest is ignored.

The result is a tariff of exploitation rather than of protection. If such a bill is passed and becomes law, it will not do the Republican Party any good at the coming election. Each interest which is so advanced may cast a grateful ballot at a coming election, but even so they will be in a minority compared to the mass of voters who get high prices without high wages out of the arrangement.

Without reading, I ask leave to put in an article from the New York Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IRRATIONAL GLOVE TARIFF.

Senator SMOOT, of the Finance Committee, using the economic sense he possesses in large measure, tried to steer the mad McCumber tariff makers away from the folly which makes their glove schedules an irrational tariff. But they, like Mr. Littauer, thought they knew more than the world's economists and bankers, or, more likely, they didn't care so long as they piled up the duties.

Even if Mr. Littauer's dream of pre-war prices came true, a 2 percent duty on \$8 was 25 per cent, but a 60 per cent duty on \$8 is \$4.80, or an increase of 140 per cent. And such treatment of American women, newly possessed of the ballot, is nothing less than political as well as economic lunacy.

Mr. SIMMONS. I now ask leave to put in another editorial from the New York Herald, in which the severest language used by any newspaper in referring to this bill is indulged in. I shall not read it, but I desire to have it go in the RECORD at this point to accompany these five or six other editorials.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HERALD'S TARIFF STAND.

The American Economist, which is the organ of the American Tariff League, is pained by the position of the New York Herald toward the Fordney-McCumber tariff makers. The American Economist thinks that the New York Herald "returns to its first love," free trade, "the faith in which it was established by James Gordon Bennett, the elder,

and maintained by James Gordon Bennett, the younger." And the American Economist sees the New York Herald "as pronouncedly opposed to the protective tariff as it was under the Bennett régime."

What the New York Herald was in respect of political policies, economic principles, or anything else under its former ownerships has nothing to do with its principles and policies under its present ownership. As a matter of fact, the owner of the New York Herald is, always has been, and always expects to be a believer in a sound, rational, workable protective tariff for American industries and American labor.

The New York Herald, reflecting the protective principles and convictions of its owner, is a consistent and steadfast advocate of the American tariff system. But the owner of the New York Herald can not stand for damn fool protectionism, and the New York Herald will not stand for it.

Mr. SIMMONS. One of these editorials I have just put in the RECORD declares this bill is nothing less than criminal in its stupidity. Another declares that it is political and economic lunacy.

Another characterizes it as foolhardy and harmful, and another, the New York Herald, a Republican and protectionist organ, refers to it as "damn fool protectionism." I dislike to use those ugly words, but those are the descriptive words used in the quotation from these great Republican journals.

That is not all. I want to nail this business, because the Senator from North Dakota has stated the only reason which has been given by any Republican for this revolt of the Republican press of the country against this bill, and I want to nail it effectually before I leave it, to the end that it may clearly and unmistakably appear that this opposition on the part of the Republican press and the Republican business men of the country, who have openly declared against it, is the outcome of a conviction that the thing is not in the interest of the people or in conformity with the Republican theory of protection.

I have here before me the Literary Digest, which has assembled statements and comments in regard to this bill from Republican, independent, and Democratic papers published in different and widely separated sections of the country. An examination of this article will show that the Republican, independent, and nonpartisan papers which have criticized or declared opposition to the measure, according to the Literary Digest, greatly outnumber those given by it as supporting the bill. I take it the papers quoted were selected as papers representative of the parties in the different sections of the country.

I will read from the list only those papers classed as Republican, independent, and nonpartisan, commercial, and agricultural papers which are opposing this bill or severely criticizing it, so that it may appear how utterly ridiculous is the charge of the subsidizing of newspapers. The papers to which I shall refer are all Republican or independent papers, farm and trade journals.

The first journal in opposition or criticism noted by the Literary Digest is the Journal of Commerce, of New York, Republican. The second is the New York Tribune, Republican. The third is the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a Republican paper also. The fourth is the Syracuse Post Standard, a Republican paper. The fifth is the Boston Transcript, an independent Republican newspaper. The sixth is the Ohio State Journal, from which I have just read, a Republican newspaper, as I understand. The seventh is the Business Farmer, of Mount Clemens, a Michigan agricultural newspaper. The eighth is the Southland Farmer, of Houston, Tex. The ninth is the New York American Agriculturist. The tenth is the St. Paul Dispatch. The eleventh is the Minnesota Journal. The twelfth is the New York Herald, Republican. The thirteenth is the New York Evening Post, Republican. The fourteenth is the New York Globe, Republican. The fifteenth is the Kansas City Star, independent Republican. The sixteenth is the Springfield Republican. The seventeenth is the Chicago Daily News, independent Republican; and the eighteenth is the Indianapolis News, independent Republican.

It will be seen that with the exception of five or six of those papers they are not great metropolitan journals, but are papers scattered about indiscriminately throughout the country, all Republican, independent, or nonpartisan.

Mr. President, I want now briefly to discuss that part of the speech of the Senator from North Dakota in which he discussed the tariff in connection with the samples he exhibited. For a long time, as the Senator proceeded with his argument, it was difficult for me to ascertain exactly what was his objective.

Finally, in response, I believe it was, to the senior Senator from Alabama, he told us that his main purpose was to show that the great department stores, which he claimed were the chief importers, were making enormous profits out of their importations by reason of the fact that they were both importers and retailers; that they got the high profits which the importer

ordinarily makes, and, added to that, the enormous profits which the retailers of this country are making. That, we finally were assured, was his main objective. Yet, for more than half an hour the Senator stood before the Senate producing sample after sample of imported articles, explaining to the Senate that the invoice price or landed cost of the article was so-and-so, a very small price, and then giving the high retail selling price of the foreign article in the American market, declaring that the spread between those prices was attempted to be covered in his bill by a tariff duty of such a per cent ad valorem, and then he proceeded to discuss the utter inadequacy of that rate of duty to cover this wide spread.

He exhibited to the Senate, by way of illustration, an ordinary straw hat, which he said was an English hat, the invoice or landing cost being 69 cents, as he alleged, and he said that foreign-made hat, which cost 69 cents, sold at retail in the markets of the United States for \$4.50. He pointed out the inadequate insufficiency of the tariff rates in his bill to cover that spread. Such was the argument and such was the statement of the Senator as to practically every article he exhibited. What was his purpose in declaring to the Senate that there was such a spread between the foreign price of the articles and their selling prices in the American market, if it was not to create the impression in the country that that spread was the thing at which the tariff should legitimately be leveled, and that the rates which he had put in his bill instead of being too high or excessive were utterly insufficient to cover that spread?

The Senator did not give the price charged by the American manufacturer for the comparable American product, the retail price of the domestic article. He gave us simply the two figures—the landing cost and the selling price in this market of the foreign article, which was, as we all now know, the retail selling price. When the Senator took his seat, an American citizen who was not familiar with the tariff and the basis on which tariff duties ought to be levied would have assumed that there was an advantage in favor of the foreigner, in the case of the hat, of about \$3.80, which ought to be covered, under the theory of the pending bill, by a rate sufficient to measure that difference.

That was the line of argument and that was the impression which would have been conveyed but for the statement the Senator from North Dakota subsequently made in response to the observations upon his statement and argument by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. President, I think the subject ought to be dealt with fairly. I state right now that not an argument made by the Senator on yesterday, drawn from the prices which he gave with respect to the samples he displayed, had anything whatsoever to do with the question of the adequacy or the inadequacy of the rates in the bill, because it is not conceivable that anybody would maintain that a tariff upon an imported article should be sufficiently high to cover the difference between the invoice or manufacturer's price of the foreign article and the price at which that article sells at retail in the American market. The tariff has nothing properly to do with the high retail prices at which a foreign product sells in the American market.

The retail price at the present time, as we all know, of the domestic article or the retail price of the foreign article in our market to-day bears very little comparable relation to the cost of production in either this country or the foreign country in which the competing article is produced. At present, as well as during the war, in many, if not in most instances, the retail price is established and maintained in defiance and in violation of all economic laws, and that profiteering is the element of chief power in them. These retail prices are in many instances, as we know, from 200 to 300 and 400 per cent higher than the manufacturer's or the producer's price.

Take the common article of the Irish potato. That is an agricultural product. When that product leaves the hands of the producer in many instances the barrel of potatoes does not sell for more than 75 cents or \$1. When it reaches the wholesaler it is probably sold by him to the retailer for \$2 or possibly \$2.50 a barrel. When the retailer divides it up and sells it by the peck or the quart, it has advanced in price to five, six, or seven dollars a barrel. So it is with all lines of business in the country. We know it. It is a matter of everyday experience and knowledge that the retail prices are excessive as compared with the original price obtained by the producer, and that at present profiteering is the chief element of weight in arriving at and fixing the price. But we are supposed to be framing a permanent tariff, and it is hoped there will soon be an end to these profiteering practices.

But why, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota—and I am sorry he is not in his seat this morning—is

the retailer of the foreign article able to get such a high price in the American market for these foreign products which the Senator displayed? Is it not because, and solely because, the American product sells at an equally high or higher price in this market? If the hat which the Senator displayed cost only 69 cents and was sold in the retail market in this country for \$4.50, undoubtedly it was because the domestic hat of like character and kind was being sold in the retail markets for at least \$4.50.

If the Senator from North Dakota had wanted to be fair in this matter, I think he would not have made a comparison between the producer's price and the retail price in order to find the spread which should be measured by the tariff. What should he have done if he wished to make a fair comparison for the purpose of levying a tariff tax? Mr. President, he should have given the Senate not only the invoice or landing price of the foreign-made hat and of the other foreign-made articles which he exhibited here yesterday but he should have given us the American manufacturer's price for a similar and comparable hat. Those two prices would have been the basis of comparison for the purpose of ascertaining the tariff under the theory under which the bill is framed. And yet the Senate will bear me out when I state that in no instance on yesterday when the Senator from North Dakota was making, as he claimed, a tariff argument, when he was stating to the country the spread which ought to be covered by the tariff, did he undertake to give us what was the American manufacturer's selling price of any one of the articles he displayed. He gave us the foreign invoice price, which is the foreign manufacturer's price with no profit added except the manufacturer's profit, and he ought to have given us at the same time, if he wanted to make a proper comparison, the American manufacturer's selling price with no profit added except the manufacturer's profit. Then we would have had the spread which, according to the theory of this bill, ought to be covered by the tariff duty.

Did the Senator give them? Why did the Senator consume an hour of the time of the Senate in giving us the difference between the foreign invoice landed cost and the retail price at which the foreign products were sold in this market and telling us about the greatness of the spread and the inadequacy of the tariff rates which he is imposing to cover that spread? He knew as well as I know that the proper spread to be covered, according to the theory of the bill, was not the difference between the foreign invoice price and the retail price but the difference between the foreign invoice price and the American manufacturer's price. Why did not the Senator give these figures and facts to us? If the Senator will get those prices upon representative articles and transactions and present them to the Senate, I think it will be easy to show that the duties which he has imposed in this bill not only measure the spread but greatly exceed the spread and allow thereby the manufacturer to advance his present prices without fear of competition from abroad.

I heard a few days ago that this side show was to be staged here. I heard that a squad of appraisers had been organized and were flying about over the country from one port of entry to another port of entry trying to find cases to bolster up the rates in the bill, and that they were bringing in a line of samples which were a little later to be exhibited with dramatic stage effect to the Senate. I supposed, naturally, we were going to have samples of the foreign articles and samples of the domestic articles with which to make comparison, but we did not have any samples of domestic articles; we had only samples of foreign articles. I supposed the Senator from North Dakota was going to undertake to compare the landed cost of the foreign product with the domestic manufacturer's cost price in this country, and that he would have those two prices here at the time he compared the domestic sample with the foreign sample.

Supposing that, I read into the RECORD the day before yesterday a letter addressed to me by an importer, in which he said that the majority members of the Finance Committee, through the Tariff Commission, had requested him to send them a statement of his profits, and that he had very promptly complied, but that he had suggested that in order to be fair about it they ought also to get the profits of the American manufacturer and wholesaler, to compare his profits with their profits. The letter said that he had received a reply from the Tariff Commission saying that the Finance Committee had only asked them for the importer's profits; that they had not asked for the domestic wholesaler's or the domestic manufacturer's profits. I read that letter to the Senate and called the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee to it and requested him to have the Tariff Commission ascertain the profits of the American

producer or wholesaler of the articles upon which he had asked the importer's profits. I have not heard about it since, and I do not suppose I will ever hear about it again. Concealment and camouflage are the order of the day on the part of the proponents of the tariff measure.

Now, Mr. President, I stated in the outset that the speech of the Senator from North Dakota had but two objects:

One was to convince the country of the truth of his charge that the opposition to his bill from Republican and independent newspapers was the result of sinister influences upon those newspapers exerted by the importers and the department stores. I think that I have sufficiently exposed that pretense, if, indeed, it needed any further exposure.

The only other purpose of the Senator's argument seemed to be to draw a comparison between the producer's selling price of foreign products and the retail selling price in this country. I think that I have shown and shown conclusively that, so far from that being a tariff argument, by no stretch of the imagination could this spread possibly have anything to do with the laying of tariff taxes. Nobody has ever contended that tariff taxes should be levied on any such basis. I think if anybody ever should contend that tariff taxes should be levied on that basis, he would write himself down as an ass. I suppose the Senator from North Dakota would not think of making such a contention; and while his speech was undoubtedly calculated to leave the impression that he thought that was a spread which could properly be covered by a tariff, nevertheless I do not think he meant to have the Senate believe or to have the country believe that he thought the spread which he disclosed to the Senate—and that was all he did with his samples—was the proper measure of the tariff which should be imposed upon these particular articles in order to protect the American producer.

Mr. President, I regret that I have taken so much time this morning. Unfortunately I had not digested what I desired to say; in fact, I did not come to the Senate expecting to speak at all to-day; I did not expect to speak until after the naval appropriation bill should have been disposed of and the consideration of the tariff bill resumed; but under the advice of some of my colleagues I have ventured to make this speech at this time. I think I owe the Senate an apology for the length of time I have taken and for the rather disconnected and inadequate manner in which I have presented the views which I desired to convey to the Senate and the country.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11939) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 8785. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Moberidge Bridge Co., of Moberidge, S. Dak., to construct a pontoon bridge across the Missouri River;

H. R. 10330. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Lake St. Croix at or near the city of Prescott, in the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 11345. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Freeport, Pa.; and

H. R. 11827. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county courts of Howard and Saline Counties, in the State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Women's Auxiliary Railway Mail Association, of Wichita, Kans., favoring the use of full steel construction and the best sanitary equipment on all cars in the Railway Postal Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution of the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Rotary Club, favoring irrigation, reclamation, and water-power development in the source stream area of the Missouri-Yellowstone watershed, so as to control the flood menace in the Mississippi Valley, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to punish the perpetrators of lynchings, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by East Boston Post, No. 608, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, pro-

testing against further reduction in the personnel of the Army and Navy, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILLIS presented the memorial of M. L. Whitis and sundry other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6258) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 773) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2597) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," approved September 25, 1914; reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 774) thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 15, 1922, they presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 2664. An act for the relief of Jesse Goodin;

S. 2666. An act for the relief of Ed Thomas and Pauline Thomas;

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositaries of public moneys in foreign countries and in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution to authorize the loan by the Secretary of War to the commander in chief of the United Confederate Veterans of cots for the use of the members of the United Confederate Veterans during the sessions of the national encampment of the United Confederate Veterans at Richmond, Va., from June 19 to 22, 1922.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 3710) for the relief of the dependent widow and children of Herman Mednick, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3711) providing for the enlargement, extension, remodeling, and improvement of the Federal building located at the corner of Washington and Johnson Streets, Borough of Brooklyn, New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 3712) granting an increase of pension to J. K. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ERNST:

A bill (S. 3713) to establish a bureau of prohibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 11939) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11228) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 9 on page 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore made the Secretary will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. POMERENE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|         |            |                |             |
|---------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| Borah   | Dillingham | Heflin         | Ladd        |
| Bursum  | Edge       | Hitchcock      | La Follette |
| Cameron | Ernst      | Jones, N. Mex. | Lenroot     |
| Capper  | Gerry      | Jones, Wash.   | Lodge       |
| Caraway | Glass      | Kellogg        | McCormick   |
| Curtis  | Harrell    | Kendrick       | McCumber    |
| Dial    | Harris     | King           | McKinley    |

|           |            |            |              |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|
| McNary    | Overman    | Sheppard   | Underwood    |
| Nelson    | Pepper     | Simmons    | Wadsworth    |
| Newberry  | Phipps     | Smoot      | Walsh, Mass. |
| Nicholson | Pittman    | Sterling   | Walsh, Mont. |
| Norbeck   | Poindexter | Sutherland | Watson, Ind. |
| Norris    | Pomerene   | Swanson    | Willis       |
| Oddie     | Ransdell   | Townsend   |              |

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. WATSON of Georgia] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will state the first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Washington whether there have been any reductions in the number of civilian employees in the office of the Secretary of the Navy or whether this bill carries substantially the same appropriation for civilian employees in the Navy Department as in the past?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There have been a great many reductions in the number of civilian employees in the service, particularly in the navy yards, but I think there have been practically no reductions in the office of the Secretary.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether there have been any reductions in the number of civilian employees in the clerical force in Washington; and if not, why not?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will give the Senator a statement showing the number of civilian employees in the Navy Department from June, 1916, down to the present time. On June 30, 1916, there were 787 civilian employees in the department; on December 31, 1918, as a result of the war, that number had been increased to 6,388; on February 28, 1922, the number had been reduced to 1,762; on April 30, 1922, the number was 768, and practically remains at that figure at the present time.

Mr. KING. Then there was an increase in the number during the year?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There was an increase of six civilian employees on April 30, 1922. What the number is at the immediate moment I can not state.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the number is not so very large—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to say in that connection, by way of further explanation to the Senator, with regard to the numbers that I have given, that of the number of 6,388 civilian employees in the department on December 31, 1918, approximately 4,000 were naval reservists employed on work ordinarily performed by civilian employees.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not quite clear from the Senator's statement as to the situation respecting civilian employees. I notice in the next paragraph a provision headed "Temporary employees, Navy Department," and an appropriation is carried of \$58,340. Running through the bill there will be found upon every few pages appropriations for "temporary employees" in various bureaus or agencies of the Navy Department. One would suppose that the period for "temporary employees" had ended, and that there would be with the bringing of the Navy down to what might be denominated a peace status a material reduction in the number of employees and a peace status number of civilian employees. May I inquire of the Senator why there is this appropriation for temporary employees in the Navy Department?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The purpose of that was to avoid the establishment on a permanent basis of these extra employees who were required by reason of the increase of the Navy and the increase of the naval activities during and following the war. It is much more economical to have them on a temporary basis than upon a permanent basis. It is to be hoped and expected that as we return to a reduced Naval Establishment many, if not all, of these employees can be dispensed with altogether. The Senator will notice that it is a House appropriation.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We had the benefit of a very determined effort on the part of the members of the House committee having charge of this bill to reduce the expenditures in every possible way.

Mr. KING. It will be perceived that in the particular item which has just been read by the Secretary \$72,000 is appropriated for the compensation of the employees who are immediately under the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy—employees who might be denominated his immediate employees—but that item is followed by an appropriation of nearly as much, \$58,340, for temporary employees in the same

office. I recall that the appropriation bill a year ago introduced the same policy. It seems to me that the number of temporary employees is too great, and the amount appropriated is too great. We do not know the number, except that there is a limitation as to the amount which may be paid to any particular employee.

When we return to the bill I shall move to strike out the item of \$58,340. I can not do it now, under the unanimous-consent rule that we shall consider only amendments which have been offered by the Senate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Navy Department," on page 3, line 9, after the word "offices," to strike out "\$70,000" and insert "\$85,000," so as to read:

For stationery, furniture, newspapers, plans, drawings, and drawing materials; purchase and exchange of motor trucks or motor delivery wagons; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor trucks or motor delivery wagons, and one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; garage rent; street car fares not exceeding \$500; freight, expressage, postage, typewriters, and computing machines; necessary traveling expenses for collection of records not exceeding \$100; and other absolutely necessary expenses of the Navy Department and its various bureaus and offices, \$85,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator the reason for that increase. The House doubtless made a thorough investigation, and in view of the very liberal appropriations which are carried in the bill for overhead, I can not understand the reason for the increase in the item which has just been read by the Secretary.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is no increase in the appropriation carried in the bill on that account. The \$15,000 added at that point is deducted on page 40 of the bill, line 23. It is occasioned by the transfer of certain appropriations hitherto carried under different heads, but really covering employees in the Navy Department, so that the appropriation will be made directly for the actual purpose for which it is used.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this bill contains very liberal appropriations for every bureau and every agency of the Government; and yet we find here this item of \$85,000 for contingent expenses, notwithstanding, as I stated, the very liberal appropriations which are carried in the bill and which would seem to embrace every conceivable expenditure that might be made by the Navy Department.

I think those who had expected material reductions in the Navy bill will experience some disappointment when they are advised of the fact that the bill carries substantially \$300,000,000. I am not sure as to the amount of obligations which will have to be met later on that are created by the bill, or how many executory contracts are authorized to be entered into which will pledge the Government to larger appropriations in the future; but the bill itself calls for direct appropriations of approximately \$300,000,000, and in addition it authorizes, I think, the expenditure of unexpended balances which heretofore have been authorized and which aggregate a good many millions of dollars.

Anybody who reads this bill very carefully will be impressed with the fact that the overhead expenses are enormous. I do not know whether they are greater proportionately than those in the Army or not; but when you examine the bill, the various items, the provisions for civilians and for the multitude of activities herein provided for, the impression will grow and continue to grow that we are paying very dearly for our whistle. I do not recall just exactly the cost of the Navy per annum prior to 1916, but my recollection is that it was around \$100,000,000 a year, and from that down. Notwithstanding the work of the Washington conference, which was hailed by some of our friends throughout the land as the greatest achievement of all time and as the great panacea for all the ills of the world and as a method to relieve the American people of the burdens of taxation, we are called upon to pay approximately \$300,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy for the coming year. The Army bill carries an appropriation which, as I recall, exceeds this; so that for the Army and Navy of this Republic in times of peace—a Republic which theoretically is pledged to peace throughout the world—we are to burden the American people with between six and seven hundred million dollars for the coming year.

Business is depressed; the people everywhere are groaning beneath the heavy burdens of taxation; and it has been averred that the Army and the Navy were to be the avenues through which we might pass to escape the oppressive burdens of taxation which were imposed upon the American people. Now we are confronted with the fact that the American people are to

be taxed approximately \$650,000,000 to \$700,000,000 for the coming year, in time of peace, although before the war our appropriations for all purposes were approximately \$1,000,000,000.

Our Republican friends who have control of Congress, who are shaping the legislation that is enacted, are not redeeming the promises which they made to the people to relieve them from these oppressive burdens. I think this bill carries at least fifty to seventy-five million dollars more than it ought to carry, and that by adequate pruning and by a proper consideration of the imperative needs of the Navy we could have subtracted from this bill at least fifty to seventy-five million dollars and have given to the American people an adequate and up-to-date Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 3, after line 18, to insert:

That portion of the appropriation for the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year 1922 which may be necessary to execute printing and binding for the Navy Department under orders placed with the Public Printer during the fiscal year 1922, within the total allotment to the Navy Department for that fiscal year, is hereby reappropriated and made available during the fiscal year 1923 for that purpose.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise to inquire of the Senator if under existing law there was no obligation upon the part of the Government Printing Office, or the custodian of the money, or the agency to which it was appropriated, to cover into the Treasury of the United States any unexpended balance?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There would not be any obligation to cover it in at least until the end of the fiscal year; and the purpose is to make the money which has already been appropriated available to do the work which has accumulated for the current fiscal year, not the work that is to be current in the fiscal year covered by this bill. This reappropriation of the money is to make it available for the work for which it was originally appropriated, but which has not been done, due to causes of various kinds in the Government Printing Office which made them behind in the current work.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator the amount that will be unexpended at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. POINDEXTER. In the neighborhood of \$100,000.

Mr. KING. Is any appropriation carried in the bill, other than this reappropriation, for the same work which was to be performed by this appropriation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; this is the only appropriation for that work. There is an appropriation in the bill for current work for the year 1923, but not for the work that is on hand now.

Mr. KING. Then there will be no method, except by going to the books and tracing the various appropriation bills and the items, of determining just what was expended for printing for the fiscal year 1922 and for the fiscal year 1923?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It could be very easily determined by an examination of the accounts of the Government Printing Office showing what work was done with this money, thereby determining what work for the year 1922 was paid for out of this appropriation, and what work was done for the year 1923 which would be paid for out of the appropriation for that year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I know that the habit of carrying over appropriations has been persisted in until it almost has the force of law. It would be far better, it seems to me, not only for economy but for accuracy, and in order to determine just what the expenditures are from year to year, if at the end of a fiscal year any amount which remains unappropriated should be covered into the Treasury, and then, if additional money is required to complete some incomplete work, application should be made in the regular way and the appropriation obtained in the regular way. I think the present condition makes for extravagance and waste, and for a sort of lax and confused method of performing work.

#### SALE OF LIQUORS ON AMERICAN SHIPS.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I shall interrupt the consideration of the pending bill just a minute. I notice that Mr. Lasker, of the Shipping Board, says you can not run a ship without liquor. I should like to remind him that you can not run a blind tiger without liquor, either. People have not been very successful in running saloons without liquor. You could not very well run a gambling joint without it. There are any number of institutions we might name which thrive upon the sale of liquor. However, I have never before known an officer of the United States to undertake to defend the violation of the law on the ground of necessity.

Of course, Mr. Lasker does not pretend to be a lawyer; he is an expert on publicity, and nothing else, Lasker publicity; but there is no lawyer, however he may have been limited in his practice—the Senator from North Dakota intimated yesterday that we were running a justice of the peace court here in the Senate Chamber—there is no lawyer who has practiced law even in that high court who would pretend that they can sell whisky or wine or intoxicating liquors of any kind on board American ships anywhere without violating the law. Any lawyer who had waived his examination and been admitted to the bar who would assert that in any decent company would be laughed out of court. It is a question of determining to sell whisky though the law says it shall not be sold.

What pains me more is that Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, who is presumed to sit here as the guardian of the prohibition forces of this country, who, I have understood, has claimed that all prohibition legislation has originated in his office, should connive at this open, flagrant violation of the law. He says that the man who called attention to the violation of the law was trying to discredit prohibition. That may be good logic for Wayne B. Wheeler, but no one else will accept it. Whenever the time comes that the man who calls attention to a violation of the law is the man who encourages violation of the law, of course that ends law enforcement, and when Mr. Wheeler made that statement he was not any more candid than in the statement he made to me about the judges' bill, which he would not affirm over his own signature. I voted for prohibition. I do not think we have always gotten out of it the good effects the legislation ought to bring. I have sometimes been disappointed in its effect. People have not always accepted the view I entertained, and all communities have not looked with favor upon the law. But I have never before known a law-enforcing officer to apologize for not enforcing the law, and expect people to commend him for it.

The Attorney General says he will hold to the opinion rendered by former Assistant Attorney General Frierson, a Democrat, until the courts shall decree otherwise. Mr. Lasker says he will hold to the opinion of a lawyer, whose name is so much like beer that I can not pronounce it, until the courts hold otherwise. Mr. Haynes says that between the two he is not going to do anything, and Mr. Wheeler, the guardian of prohibition, and who is paid for that, says that any man who calls attention to the sale of liquor is trying to discredit prohibition.

Between them and among them they are countenancing an open, flagrant, daily violation of the law. Whether a man be for prohibition or against it, he ought to be for law enforcement, and when the time has come that the highest officials of the land—the Attorney General and the chairman of the Shipping Board, and, aside from these, the accredited agent of all the temperance people of America—shall condone the sale of liquor, open and flagrant, and apologize, one saying you can not run a ship without it, another saying that somebody else said they can do it legally, and the man who is charged with the enforcement says that as between the two opinions he can not do anything, I am curious to know what the temperance people are going to do.

I know, and every lawyer knows, that wherever the American flag flies over an American ship it is American territory, and a violation of the law of America upon that ship is a violation of the law as much as if it took place here under the shadow of the dome of this Capitol. It is childish, it is foolish, it is dishonest for anyone to make any other contention.

I do not believe the Attorney General is going to try to enforce the law against the sale of liquor, although he is the chief law officer of this Nation, and yet he says:

I understand that a former Assistant Attorney General has ruled it is a violation of the law, and I will acquiesce in his decision, but do nothing until somebody else gets the matter to the courts and ascertains what the courts will say—

Which means no enforcement, and everybody might as well understand it. All the millions of women through the States who have been praying for prohibition, who have been working for prohibition, who have believed that it meant the salvation of the race, may as well realize now as later that there is to be no enforcement of prohibition as long as the present Attorney General is at the head of the law-enforcing branch of the Government. I do not care whether he was ever in a court or not—and I understand he never was in a court to try a case—I know a man can not hang around a justice of the peace court as many years as he has without knowing that it is a violation of the law to sell whisky on an American ship, when it is a violation of the law to sell whisky in the District of Columbia under our national amendment and prohibition law.

I presume that when our friends on the other side bring in a ship subsidy bill one item in it will be for so many hundred thousand or millions of dollars for the purchase of whisky to

be sold on the subsidized American ships, because Mr. Lasker says you can not run them without it, that it would be suicide to run a ship without selling whisky on it. Therefore, if you are going to tax the people to run the ships be candid and say that so much is for the subsidy and so much for keeping the liquor stock always replenished.

I can see my friend, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], who has been so ardently fighting in the ranks of prohibition, voting enthusiastically for a ship subsidy, with a certain knowledge that he is voting to license as many saloons as we have ships. If he votes for a ship subsidy every man and woman in Ohio will know that he voted to license a saloon, and every other man who votes for a subsidy will vote to license saloons. Then, if they want to be fair, if the rich, who are able to travel on ships, are to be permitted to buy whisky, why not legalize saloons here, where the workman can always get his drink? Let us not play favorites. Let us proclaim to the world that we were hypocrites—as some people have suspected—and that we believe in selling whisky, but that we want to do it under a pretense that we are subsidizing ships. That is all it is.

Wayne B. Wheeler, for whom I have had some respect heretofore, and have not a bit now, after reading the opinion that he is alleged to have given out, that he thinks that one who calls attention to the violation of the law is fighting prohibition, and his other pretense that we need more legislation. He wants a 25-mile limit instead of a 3-mile limit. If you can legally cross the 3-mile limit with a cargo of liquor, you could cross 25 miles, and the thirsty could hold their breath until they got out of the 25-mile limit. It is such a cheap subterfuge, such a patent endeavor to accept the money of the prohibitionists of this country and tolerate the open, notorious violation of the law.

I hope—I will not say hope, because that implies expectation, and I have not any—but in the interest of decency I wish some of you gentlemen close to the Attorney General would ask him to enforce one law. I will not be hard on him and ask him to enforce more, because I do not think he would do it, but he ought to enforce this one law, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], who has always rushed to the defense of the Attorney General when anybody criticized him, ought to go to him and say, "Mr. Attorney General, in the interest of common decency now let us enforce this law." I appeal to the Senator from Ohio, as soon as he can get some one to take the chair, to call on his friend from Ohio to put an end to this shameful traffic in liquor.

The Senator from Ohio was a lecturer for the Anti-Saloon League, I understand, and hails from the same State from which come Mr. Wheeler and the Attorney General, and clear out into Arkansas we look to that trio to keep us dry. I have no kind of influence with any of them, except the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], and I am appealing to him to urge upon Mr. Wheeler and the Attorney General to have this one law enforced.

However light this may seem to some people, I know that there are millions of people in this country who look upon the violation of this law with more disfavor than upon the violation of any other law on the statute books. It is an insult to them. It is a disappointment to them. It is a shameful violation of the law to permit this open, flagrant running of saloons under the guise of running ships. I hope that before there is brought before the Congress for its consideration a ship subsidy bill these men will be dissuaded from asking us to vote away \$100,000,000 a year to enable people to run saloons. I use the word "hope" as applying to my friend the Senator from Ohio, in whom I have confidence, whom I know to be a good man, whom I know to be a sincere man, and whom I know to be influential with these two gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, and I believe he will have them stop this outrageous violation of the law.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has called attention to an agency of the Government which has been the subject of criticism almost from the hour of its creation. In my opinion it has merited much of the criticism leveled against it, and its present policies have not tended to blunt the sharp edge of public criticism. No Government agency has been more extravagant and inefficient. Its officials in the past and those who now control it seem indifferent to public censure. If there were any hope of reforms or improvement, there would be a disposition to cover the past with a mantle of charity. There is much advertisement and publicity and promise upon the part of those who direct the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, but there are no achievements and no satisfactory developments.

And now Mr. Lasker and others connected with this corporation are engaged in an intensive and extensive drive to secure

a ship subsidy. Some of these officials are carrying on a vigorous propaganda to force public opinion and to put through the bill formulated by Mr. Lasker and his aids and subordinates.

I had supposed that when Congress created boards and commissions and Federal positions and executive agencies it was the duty of the persons selected for service therein to execute the law, to perform the duties defined by statute, and to not spend their time as crusaders and propagandists in support of some plan to extend their authority or some policy which the administration desired to force through the National Congress.

President Harding has the right to recommend to Congress the passage of a subsidy bill. That is his business. I think his policy is unwise, and I shall oppose it. But it is no part of the duty of executive employees to spend their time and efforts as missionaries to carry forward Mr. Harding's plans. Mr. Lasker and the members of the board and other agencies of the Government should devote their energies to the discharge of their duties; their time ought to be devoted to the execution of the law and not to carrying on propaganda in favor of executive policies. If they so conduct themselves, I think they ought to be called to account; perhaps their salaries ought to be cut off. They might then give their attention to their duties, instead of engaging in propaganda and spending their time advocating policies which will increase their authority and extend the functions and powers of executive agencies.

I think it has become a public scandal the manner in which some executive officials spend their time in writing, in crusading, in engaging in various activities throughout the country to drive through policies which some executive department or agency desires and which will increase their authority, augment their power, and multiply the number of Federal employees. Mr. Lasker is now engaged in the pleasing task of writing articles in favor of a ship subsidy, and we are told that others connected with the Shipping Board are giving some of their time to the task of converting the American people to the beauties of a ship subsidy. Who appointed them and paid them to carry on a propaganda in favor of a policy to which a large number of the American people are opposed? Mr. Lasker was not appointed to the position which he occupies in order to be a missionary in favor of a ship-subsidy scheme which will further tax the American people. I respectfully submit that he is subject to criticism because of his partisan efforts and persistent zeal to secure a ship subsidy of millions of dollars annually.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. If this, to me, so absurd ruling is correct that a ship goes beyond the 3-mile limit and the protection of the law when it goes beyond the 3-mile limit, what is there to indicate that an American ship is American territory at all? If they can violate the liquor law that way, could they not cut the captain's throat and there be no law to punish them?

Mr. KING. The Senator from Arkansas is an able lawyer, and I think he can answer that question perhaps better than I can. I suppose that one of the evidences that it is an American ship is that the Stars and Stripes fly from the masthead.

Mr. CARAWAY. But if the one law can be ignored as soon as they get beyond the 3-mile limit does any other law follow the ship?

Mr. KING. The question of the Senator answers itself. Obviously not. I agree with the Senator that the law should be enforced. I believed the eighteenth amendment to be unwise. I thought it was an infringement upon the rights of the States, that it interfered with their sovereign powers, and would prove a dangerous precedent which would eventually lead to the destruction of the police powers of the States; but it has become a part of the organic law of the Republic and we ought to enforce it. Those who violate the Volstead Act or other laws passed pursuant to the eighteenth amendment should be punished as the courts punish those who violate other laws of the land.

Mr. CARAWAY. The thing I was inquiring about, because I have a great deal of admiration for the legal learning of my friend the Senator from Utah, is if this law will not follow the ship and the flag, no other law can do so, and anybody could seize one of our ships outside the 3-mile limit and plunder us of every dollar's worth of goods. There would be no law to punish them, because the ship ceases to be American territory when it gets beyond the 3-mile limit. It is so absurd that the very quarrel we had with Germany would reflect upon us, because she never came within the 3-mile limit to sink any of our ships. She waited until they got outside and then sunk them. Now, the question of the law being enforced is raised in this way, and there is no law to protect the American and

to prevent the violation of American law on an American ship when it is beyond the 3-mile limit. It is so absolutely absurd that it ought to shock everybody.

Mr. KING. I am a little surprised to learn that Mr. Wheeler, to whom the Senator has referred, should entertain the views which the Senator expresses, because I have a rather indistinct recollection that Mr. Wheeler or others representing the Anti-Saloon League some time ago insisted that we enact a law which would prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in China by Americans.

Mr. CARAWAY. Why, of course.

Mr. KING. They wanted the laws of the United States to extend to China and other countries if Americans happened to be there. How they could advocate that policy and yet advocate the vending of liquors upon American ships is something I can not quite understand.

Mr. CARAWAY. I want to get another opinion from the Senator from Utah. I was shown a statement issued by Mr. Wheeler a while ago by the Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY, in which Wheeler said he wants the law amended so that we shall have a 25-mile limit instead of a 3-mile limit. Can the Senator see any virtue in that? If they can legally cross the 3-mile limit with a floating saloon, they could cross the 25-mile limit as well, could they not?

Mr. KING. I think if a man wants to drink liquor or a ship wants to sell liquor the distance between the 3-mile limit and the 25-mile limit will quickly be covered.

Mr. CARAWAY. And where does the efficacy come in? If the 3-mile limit has no legal effect, what effect would the 25-mile limit have? Does the law depend upon the number of miles?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Perhaps it would enable them to secure a better price.

Mr. CARAWAY. They would be able to charge a higher price when they got out beyond the 25-mile limit.

Mr. KING. It may be the purpose to increase the speed of the ships after they cross the 3-mile limit in order to reach the 25-mile limit.

Mr. CARAWAY. And come in more slowly.

Mr. KING. Yes.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11228) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 6, after line 12, to strike out:

#### EXPERIMENTAL AND RESEARCH LABORATORY.

For laboratory and research work and other necessary work of the experimental and research laboratory for the benefit of the naval service, as authorized in the naval appropriation act approved August 29, 1916, including the construction of temporary test houses, additions to equipment, the operation of a laboratory, maintenance of buildings and grounds, and the employment of scientific civilian assistants as may become necessary, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, \$100,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for technical, drafting, clerical, and messenger service shall not exceed \$25,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I should like to have some information from the Senator in charge of the bill with reference to this amendment. It is apparently intended to eliminate the experimental research laboratory.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was unable to hear the Senator on account of the confusion in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill if he will not make some explanation of the item. It is apparently intended to eliminate the experimental and research laboratory. That feature of our Naval Establishment, it will be recalled, was inaugurated by virtue of the act of August 29, 1916, upon, as my recollection is, the suggestion and earnest advocacy of Mr. Edison, who felt that the Navy ought to have the benefit of whatever inventive genius there is in the country. I supposed this was a very general and popular feature of our Naval Establishment. I should like to know what impelled the committee to take this course.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think, so far as its being popular is concerned, very little is known about the laboratory. I doubt very much whether anybody knows what it consists of or what

it is doing. As a matter of fact, it is a group of more or less expensive buildings at a place called Bellevue, in the District of Columbia, on the shores of the Potomac River. There is nothing going on there at all except construction work on the buildings. There seems to be little or no equipment in the buildings. The appropriation of \$100,000 carried in the bill could not possibly result in any very great amount of scientific work being done. It looked to the committee as though it would be throwing \$100,000 away. It does not amount to anything more than the employment of a lot of supernumeraries connected with the laboratory without accomplishing any result.

I am in entire accord with the Senator from Montana, if I understood him correctly, as to the desirability of promoting scientific study as to naval equipment, naval appliances, and machinery.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 26 the bill carries an appropriation of \$200,000 for an engineering experiment station at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. That experiment station is in operation. It has been in operation for some years. The committee felt that scientific experiments ought to be carried on there and that that station should be properly supported, rather than waste a portion of our money on a large, expensive embryo establishment at Bellevue. That establishment is really an outgrowth of the war or of preparation for the war. We are confronted in this case, as we are in many other cases, with the question of getting back to normal conditions, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, of going on with more or less extravagant and exaggerated activities which never would have been established but for the war.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I do not think the items to which the Senator has called our attention, for the continuance of the experiment station at the Naval Academy, meets the conditions for which the experimental and research laboratory was established. The experiment station at the academy, as a matter of course, is conducted by the officers of the Navy. About the time that the war broke out, or prior thereto, a large number of inventions were offered to the Navy by inventors throughout the country. Most of them were rejected, and in all probability deservedly so, and yet our experience has disclosed that the naval officers do not know all about those things, and frequently inventions are made by people outside of both the Army and the Navy which prove invaluable in the course of time. I think we have had some rather sad experiences about the rejection of inventions of American inventors which were afterwards adopted by foreign countries.

There was a general opinion prevailing that there was a prejudice existing in the Navy Department against inventions which came from civilians. Apparently Mr. Edison shared the suspicion that the civilian inventor was not accorded the consideration to which he was entitled. No doubt Congress believed as much and made provision for the establishment of this experimental and research laboratory, where inventions which seemed to give some promise might, as I understood it, be tried out. In that connection the Naval Consulting Board was established, Mr. Edison, my recollection is, acting as chairman of the board. That seems to have gone by the board in this appropriation bill also, for the next amendment in the bill disposes of the appropriation for that purpose. My attention is called to this, Mr. President, by a very distinguished engineer, formerly of my State but now residing in New York. I send to the desk and ask that the Secretary may read a letter which I have received from him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

NAVAL CONSULTING BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES,  
New York, June 14, 1922.

Hon. T. J. WALSH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you this letter as a member and vice chairman of the Naval Consulting Board of the United States, which organization during the war realized in attempting to carry on its work to the best advantage the lack of an experimental laboratory for Navy use, and the board, through its chairman, Mr. Edison, was instrumental in securing an appropriation from Congress for the building and maintenance of the laboratory. An appropriation of \$100,000 for operating the laboratory located on the Potomac River near Washington was also made, and likewise an item of \$4,000 to defray the expenses of the Naval Consulting Board.

I am in receipt of a letter from Rear Admiral W. Strother Smith, in which he states that the Senate has cut out the item of \$100,000 for operating the laboratory, and also the item of \$4,000 for the Naval Consulting Board, including the Naval Consulting Board clerk in the office at Washington.

It is my judgment that each of the above sums of money is necessary for the purpose for which it was appropriated, and I trust that you will

be willing to use your influence in the Senate to have these two items put back on the bill. I can assure you that we shall appreciate your efforts in this direction to the utmost.

I am sending a similar letter to Senator MYERS.  
With kindest regards, I am, as always,  
Yours very truly,

B. B. THAYER.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I think it was understood at the time that the establishment of such research work designed to afford to civilian inventors an opportunity to have their inventions tried out was never in very high favor with the officers of the Navy, and I suppose that that prejudice is to a very large degree responsible for the failure to realize the expectations which were entertained concerning the development of this feature of the Naval Establishment. The Senator in charge of the bill advises us that nothing has ever been accomplished. Perhaps nothing was to be expected when the administration was left in the hands of people who were unfriendly to the enterprise from the start.

I have no interest in the matter except that I want to call attention to the fact that this promising feature of the Naval Establishment which was inaugurated in the interests of civilian inventors, so that the Navy could get the benefit of whatever inventive genius there might be outside of the officers of the Navy themselves, goes by the board and is not going to be supported any more.

Mr. NEWBERRY. Mr. President, perhaps it might throw a little light on the subject if I were to read an excerpt from the statement of the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering. The laboratory has not as yet been entirely completed. When properly equipped, possibly it might do a great deal of useful work and be placed in the category of desirable public activities; but the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, in his testimony before the House committee, when asked how the work was being done at present, said:

The sort of work that we expect will be done at the laboratory is now being undertaken at the Washington Navy Yard and by the Bureau of Standards.

The amount of money for which request was made would be used mainly to create a new staff of experts and to pay the wages of those employed to assist in the work. No doubt the activities of such a laboratory when properly equipped would be very useful to the Navy, but in the view of the committee it is not absolutely necessary at this time.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator advise us exactly what has been done in the laboratory heretofore?

Mr. NEWBERRY. As I have stated, the laboratory is not finished, and nothing has been done as yet.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. How much money has been spent upon it?

Mr. NEWBERRY. I think about a million and a half dollars have been spent upon it; but I am not certain as to the amount.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. A million and a half dollars have been spent upon it. We have entered upon this enterprise, have spent a million and a half dollars on it, have never got anywhere on it, and now we are going to abandon it?

Mr. NEWBERRY. I think the laboratory has not as yet been equipped or even finished. I am corrected in my statement in regard to the expenditures, which, I am now informed, have been \$1,200,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The situation is, then, that we entered upon the plan and system of establishing a laboratory in which could be tested out inventions of civil inventors which were supposed to be of some value in connection with naval operations. Having entered upon that plan, we spent \$1,200,000, but the laboratory has not yet been completed; the system has never been tried out; and we now propose to abandon it and to allow the civilian inventors to take their chances so far as devices of use to the Navy are concerned.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just a word, if the Senator will permit me. The appropriation contained in the House bill makes no change whatever in that respect. If this laboratory is established and maintained, there is nothing proposed that would change the control of it; it would still remain under the Navy Department, under naval officers, and the same attention would be given to civilian inventors and their inventions without this appropriation that would be given with it. There would not be any change whatever in that respect. A great many experiments are being carried on by the Navy Department, particularly at the navy yard at Philadelphia, as to new methods of the use of fuel, in which a great deal of scientific progress has been made, involving a great saving of money to the Navy by reducing the amount of fuel which is consumed.

I have received the same complaints, and I have had the same feeling to which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]

has referred about the apathy and sometimes the apparent hostility of naval officers toward the inventions that are submitted to them; but I was merely calling the attention of the Senator to the fact that that situation would not be involved or changed in any way at all by the appropriation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington means, of course, that the naval officers will be in control of the laboratory to be constructed, and that civilian inventors will be subject to exactly the same depressing influences; but my understanding is that the naval consulting board has a persuasive voice in connection with the operations of the research laboratory.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. I do not think the naval consulting board has any authority over the laboratory at all under the law. Furthermore, the naval consulting board did not accomplish a great deal. I have known several members of the naval consulting board, some of whom were men of great distinction as practical inventors and highly scientific. They were very badly treated by the majority of the naval consulting board. It seemed to resolve itself into factions and quarrels among its members, and I thought a great deal of injustice was done by the majority of the naval consulting board to some men on the board who, as was proved by subsequent events, had their criticisms and suggestions been adopted, would have been of immense value to the Navy. But, so far as the practical results of the activities of the naval consulting board are concerned, I think the Senator from Montana would have some difficulty in pointing them out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter upon any defense of the Naval Consulting Board, but my understanding was that the Naval Consulting Board was not supposed to know very much about the operation of ships or, perhaps, even about the construction of ships, nor about the general activities of the Navy. I associated the Naval Consulting Board with the movement to establish a research laboratory in the interest of the civilian inventors, and that the two appropriations go together here and that they fall together has confirmed me in the belief that the two are associated. So I imagine very likely that the civilian inventor whose invention went into the research laboratory had some kind of a proper consideration in that the laboratory was, in some way at least, under the control or supervision of the Naval Consulting Board, consisting of civilians.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him in order to ask a question of the Senator from Montana or the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will one or the other of the two Senators tell the Senate how and under what circumstances the construction of this laboratory was begun? Was an appropriation made for it in an appropriation bill or was it provided for in a lump-sum appropriation during the war?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There was a special appropriation in the act of 1916, at the time when the Navy entered upon its enlarged program, undoubtedly through the apprehension created by the European war, although it was before we entered the war.

Mr. McCORMICK. How long has it been since any work has been done on the laboratory?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is some work under way toward the completion of the building.

Mr. McCORMICK. Has work toward the completion of the building been carried on during the last year?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the act of August 29, 1916, was the act in which this country got ready for war. I was acting chairman of the Naval Committee at that time, and those who knew the situation were satisfied that ultimately this country would get into war with Germany.

Mr. McCORMICK. When was that?

Mr. SWANSON. I refer to the act of August 29, 1916.

Mr. McCORMICK. That was before the election of that year?

Mr. SWANSON. It was August 29, 1916.

Mr. McCORMICK. Was it before the election of that year that those to whom the Senator refers were satisfied that we were going to war?

Mr. SWANSON. I am not indulging in petty politics, although the Senator does not seem to be able to get above it. The act itself shows what preparations were made; the act speaks for itself better than the Senator from Illinois or I, in a partisan way, could speak for it. That act, on account of the

emergency, increased the Navy from 55,000 to 87,000 men, and authorized the President, if he saw proper, to make a survey of all the navy yards and of all the ships. At that time we were trying to get ready for war. The act to which I have referred was really designed, if the emergency should arise, to be prepared for it. That is the reason I may say the Navy was ready when war was declared, regardless of any election. All that it is necessary to do in order to be satisfied of that fact is to read the act itself.

In that act a provision was also made to secure the services and cooperation of the inventors and scientific men of the country, so as to obtain the benefit of their labor and their knowledge. We could not get a scientist to work for the Navy unless he was given a commission. The act which I have mentioned authorized the employment of men such as Edison, men who were particularly expert in connection with the telephone and telephone inventions, and also explosives. At the same time a laboratory was established. I may say that Mr. Edison did splendid work. The listening device, to a large extent, was evolved by the consulting board, and it proved to be really one of the best means of fighting the submarine. I might also mention the depth bomb. Other civilians outside of the Navy did splendid work.

The provision was put in the bill as a war measure in order to enable the Navy to get ready for hostilities. Various scientists were employed. Mr. Edison was down here for months. He invented a method by which a ship could be so painted as to reduce its visibility to such an extent that the chances of a submarine on coming to the top seeing it would be lessened by at least one-half. Other schemes were devised for painting ships so as to deceive a pursuing ship and give the impression that it was going north when it was really going south.

I repeat that the establishment of the research laboratory and the Naval Consulting Board was a war measure. I am not prepared to say whether the work should be continued; I am willing to let the amendment proposed prevail so that the matter may go to conference. I have not examined to see whether or not the laboratory and the work proposed to be carried on there should be continued, but I know that the members of the Naval Consulting Board performed a valuable service. They came here and served practically without any pay whatever during the war and aided very materially in developing inventions and discoveries which were of great benefit to the Navy, as well as rendering service in consultation and advice.

I simply desire not to have the work of those men reflected on. They took no pay; they were down here at great loss and inconvenience to themselves; their own business was neglected; and they did splendid work, from my knowledge of them, during the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before we pass from this subject I desire to place in the RECORD the provisions of the act of 1916 for the establishment of the experimental and research laboratory. It is found on page 570 of volume 39 of the Statutes at Large, and reads as follows:

Experimental and research laboratory: For laboratory and research work on the subject of gun erosion, torpedo motive power, the gyroscope, submarine guns; protection against submarine, torpedo, and mine attack; improvement in submarine attachments, improvement and development in submarine engines, storage batteries and propulsion, airplanes and aircraft, improvement in radio installations, and such other necessary work for the benefit of the Government service, including the construction, equipment, and operation of a laboratory, the employment of scientific civilian assistants as may become necessary, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy (limit of cost not to exceed \$1,500,000), \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as preventing or interfering with the continuation or undertaking of necessary experimental work during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, as heretofore conducted under other appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall make detailed reports to the Congress not later than June 30, 1917, and annually thereafter, showing the manner in which all expenditures hereunder have been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 7, to strike out:

CIVILIAN NAVAL CONSULTING BOARD.

For actual expenses incurred by and in connection with the civilian naval consulting boards, including the services of one clerk, at \$1,400 per annum, for duty in connection with the board at Washington, D. C., \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Office of Judge Advocate General, Salaries, Navy Department," on page 9, after line 10, to insert:

To pay George Melling for compiling the laws and decisions relating to the Navy, Navy Department, and Marine Corps made prior to July 1, 1922, including an index thereto, and in accordance with Senate resolution of March 30, 1914, \$3,000, to be available upon completion of said work.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before proceeding to consider this amendment, may I inquire of the Senator for information, calling attention to lines 7 to 13, page 7, if in view of the reduction in the number of marines—and I will add, in passing, that the number should be still further reduced—it is necessary to employ private schools for the instruction of marines? My understanding is that we are providing at San Diego and elsewhere very adequate and efficient schools for the instruction of marines, and I am wondering whether it is necessary now to make provision to pay various States.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator misunderstands the purpose of that provision. It does not relate to marines technically at all. It relates to sailors. It does not affect the Marine Corps in any way whatever.

I will say to the Senator that these schools are entirely different schools from the naval training stations. They are maintained by the States. These sums are purely for the purpose of cooperating with the States. I think three States have expended some \$50,000 for the maintenance of these nautical schools. The experience of those schools and everybody who is familiar with those schools seems to have demonstrated that they are of immense value, far beyond the expense incident to them, in the development of the young men, even aside from promoting their usefulness and serviceability in the Navy. The parents of boys who have attended these schools are very loud in their praises of the effect upon the youths who have been trained there. They are schools maintained by the States. This provision is to reimburse the States for one-half the amount of money which they have expended.

Mr. KING. Do I understand the Senator to mean that enlisted men of the Navy are sent, after their enlistment, to these schools which are maintained by the States for instruction in the duties which they would be compelled to perform in the naval service?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. KING. Then is this a mere gratuity by the Federal Government to the States to aid them in developing a sort of a nautical branch of their educational institutions?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The purpose of it in the Navy bill is not as a gratuity at all, but it is considered in the interest of the public policy of the country to encourage the States in assisting in the maintenance of a place where young men can be instructed in the ways of the sea and at the same time disciplined to a certain extent, so that they are available not only for the merchant marine but in time of emergency would be available for the Navy. It is not regarded as a gratuity. It is regarded by the Congress—because this is simply a repetition of what Congress has done for a number of years—as the promotion of a good public policy for the country.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand—I want to get the matter clearly in my mind—a number of the States in some institutions which are maintained by public taxation have instructors who give some sort of instruction or some training in naval matters to young men who come to the State institutions?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not in naval matters but in nautical matters, which knowledge, of course, would be useful in case they should be called into the Navy.

Mr. KING. Just the same as it would be important, perhaps, that young men should know something of astronomy if they were called into the Navy; but the point I am trying to get at is that the States are maintaining certain schools, and in those schools some attention is paid to nautical matters, and the States make contributions to those schools, because they teach nautical matters?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is just the other way. The States maintain the schools and the Federal Government makes contributions to them.

Mr. KING. But there are no employees of the Government, no sailors of the Government, in those schools?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not at all.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that there is one of these schools in my State. The schools are conducted on ships which are maintained by the States. This \$25,000 is given under an act of Congress, so that it is given by law.

Mr. KING. I was aware of that fact, because I know it has been carried in a number of appropriation bills.

Mr. LODGE. The act was passed in 1911, and for a long time there were only two States, Massachusetts and New York, and I think Oregon, but I do not know. That seems to have dropped

out. I suppose it has given up the school. Pennsylvania is new.

Mr. KING. I ask for information: Has the Senator made any investigation in his own State so that he is convinced that those schools are beneficial?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, very; they are very good; and they are maintained really by the States. They have a commissioned officer on the ship in my State, and have maintained it for a great many years, and the school is on a ship.

Mr. KING. Then the amount contributed by the Federal Government would not be sufficient, of course, to maintain the school?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. KING. And the benefit to the Government is indirect—

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. KING. In that young men who attend there may subsequently come into the Navy and have the advantage of the nautical training which they have received in the State school?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is exactly it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Naval training station, California," on page 13, line 24, after the word "Island," to strike out "and San Diego," so as to read:

Maintenance of naval training station, Yerba Buena Island, Calif.: For labor and material; buildings and wharves; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and wharves; wharfage, ferrage, and street-car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; wagons, carts, implements, tools, and repairs to same; fire engines and extinguishers; gymnastic implements; models and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and materials, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; fresh water, and washing; packing boxes and materials; and all other contingent expenses; maintenance of dispensary building; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; in all, \$125,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, on account of additional information which has been received since that amendment was proposed, in view of the fact that the Navy now is in a period of transition so far as this training school is concerned between San Francisco and San Diego, and that a part of the year the school will probably have to be maintained at San Francisco and a part of the year at San Diego, I ask to have that amendment rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of what I understand to be the facts from letters which I have received, I should like to ask the acting chairman of the committee whether he believes it necessary to have two naval stations in California?

Mr. POINDEXTER rose.

Mr. KING. If I may state what my information is first, then I shall be very happy to have the Senator answer.

As I understand, at San Francisco Bay there is now a very excellent naval training station. One of the islands in that magnificent bay has been used for that purpose for a number of years. The Senator knows that many of our ships will be anchored there constantly. We shall have all classes of ships in that great harbor, both capital ships, submarines, and all kinds of naval craft. It would seem that San Francisco Bay and the surroundings are most admirably located for a naval training station, far better than San Diego. It would seem to me—and yet I profess to have no knowledge whatever upon the subject—that one naval station in California would be sufficient. To break it up, to divide it, to have the training station part of the time at San Francisco and part of the time at San Diego, would seem to me to be improper, and also expensive. May I ask the Senator the reason why there is a plan to break up or weaken the San Francisco naval training station?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator apparently was not paying attention to the speech that I made a moment ago in regard to it. The purpose of the committee is to accomplish the very thing that the Senator from Utah suggests—that is, to have only one training station on the Pacific coast. I agree with him in that. In some years past the question of whether or not that training station should have been developed at San Francisco might have been a practical question; but in recent years we have constructed at San Diego, at an expense of \$2,000,000, permanent buildings for a training school for sailors, and in view of the policy of having only one training station on the Pacific coast it is intended to abandon the temporary building at San Francisco and concentrate the training activities at San Diego. We have not increased the appropriation in any way; but the suggestion I made a moment ago was

that in the coming fiscal year there would be a period of transition between the two schools, moving from one place to the other, and in order to accommodate the appropriation to that situation I asked that both names be left in, not for the purpose of having two schools but to cover the period when they are moving from one place to the other.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand the Senator—and I did not gather this from his first statement—it is the purpose to abandon the school at San Francisco?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the intention, and that has been acted upon by Congress through a period of years.

Mr. KING. Of course, if, as the Senator stated, they have constructed buildings and a plant at San Diego costing \$2,000,000 there may be wisdom in abandoning the school at San Francisco, but it would seem to me, in view of the considerable sum which was spent at San Francisco, and in view of the fact that the school had been there for many years, that it was not the wisest policy to expend \$2,000,000 at San Diego. One would have supposed that the great San Francisco Bay, having, as I have indicated, a great fleet there, and the fullest opportunity to familiarize the students with all sorts of naval craft, would have been the ideal place for a naval training station, far better than at San Diego. However, if we are to have but one, I suppose the experts in the Navy have determined that San Diego is the place, and in view of the fact that we are to have but one, in which I concur, I shall not object to the amendment offered by the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask that the committee amendment be rejected.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator what there is in the bill to indicate the abandonment of San Francisco, and that no funds will be expended at San Francisco.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is nothing in the bill except the limitation on the appropriation, which would indicate it. It is impossible to conduct two training schools with the \$125,000 that is carried in the bill.

Mr. KING. Of course, they would be permitted to divide the appropriation if they saw fit.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not the intention of the department to divide it, but to move the school from one place to the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the committee was, under "Naval Training Station, Rhode Island," on page 14, line 14, after the words "Rhode Island," to insert "(exclusive of Coddington Point)" and a colon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 5, to strike out "\$125,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$225,000," so as to read:

In all, \$225,000.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, before we continue with the discussion, in view of the fact that this is a matter of some moment, I make a point of no quorum, in order that more Senators may be present for the consideration of the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|            |              |            |              |
|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Borah      | Harris       | McKinley   | Simmons      |
| Broussard  | Heflin       | McNary     | Smoot        |
| Bursum     | Hitchcock    | Nelson     | Spencer      |
| Cameron    | Johnson      | Newberry   | Swanson      |
| Capper     | Jones, Wash. | Nicholson  | Townsend     |
| Colt       | Kellogg      | Oddie      | Trammell     |
| Culberson  | Kendrick     | Overman    | Underwood    |
| Dial       | King         | Pepper     | Wadsworth    |
| Dillingham | Ladd         | Phillips   | Walsh, Mont. |
| Edge       | La Follette  | Pittman    | Warren       |
| Ernst      | Lenroot      | Pointexter | Willis       |
| France     | Lodge        | Pomerene   |              |
| Gerry      | McCormick    | Ransdell   |              |
| Glass      | McCumber     | Sheppard   |              |

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which the Secretary will again report.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 15, line 5, the committee proposes to strike out "\$125,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$225,000."

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee tell the Senate how the respective sums of \$125,000 and \$225,000 compare with the sum appropriated a year ago for the same purpose? The figures which have been supplied to

me indicate that the appropriation for the training station at Newport last year was \$185,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, at Newport there are a number of permanent buildings, thoroughly equipped, which have been utilized for years for housing a naval training school for apprentices in the Navy. In the management of this matter by the Navy Department that school has been abandoned during the past year.

Mr. McCORMICK. Did the Senator say "management"?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I used the word "management." I might use the word "administration." The Senator can choose whatever word he likes as the more appropriate. It was considered by the committee that instead of developing a new training school, being put to the necessity of erecting a lot of new permanent buildings while these stand idle, to the extent to which those buildings are capable of accommodating a training school they should be used, and upon hearings before the committee the details of the cost of the maintenance of a training school there for 2,500 men, which the advisers of the committee said was the number which could be accommodated there, were worked out and the amount was fixed at the amount carried in the amendment—\$225,000.

The \$125,000 carried in the bill as it passed the House would practically have been a loss, appropriated for a school which was not being used, from which no results were being obtained. If we add \$100,000 to it, we will get some benefit of the \$125,000 which was carried in the bill as it passed the House and get a training school in operation. We do not increase the total of the appropriation at all, because we take off a similar sum from Hampton Roads, and through the broadmindedness, if I may use that expression, of the member of the committee from Virginia there was no objection to that adjustment between the two States.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the appropriation for the naval training station at Newport this year, then, is \$30,000 in excess of the sum appropriated for that purpose a year ago.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I hope the Senator will not overlook the point, in dwelling upon the comparison between the amount appropriated a year ago and the amount appropriated this year, what is really the controlling feature of this question, that under the appropriation a year ago there were no activities carried on at the school. I do not know what they did with the money, but there were no men being trained there. The committee proposes that there shall be 2,500 men trained there with this increased amount.

Mr. McCORMICK. Thirty thousand dollars more is appropriated this year for the training station at Newport, and if I am rightly informed \$200,000 less is appropriated this year for the training station at Great Lakes, the only naval establishment accessible to the people of the States which lie between the watershed of the Alleghenies and those of the Rocky Mountains. Is that true?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that is true. The question is whether that is the only training station in the interior?

Mr. McCORMICK. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that is correct.

Mr. McCORMICK. It is an interesting coincidence that from Key West to Kittery Point the constituencies are dotted with ammunition dumps, guarded by companies of marines; torpedo schools; navy yards; and naval colleges. If I remember rightly, the State of North Carolina, among those States the shores of which are washed by the Atlantic, by some strange combination, has never been made the site of a naval establishment of any sort. I presume that it was the existence of the mint in North Carolina at one time which offset the development of a seafaring population at a naval base in that State.

The committee itself is, perhaps naturally, made up largely of seaboard Senators from these various States where the establishments are to be found. There are two Senators on the Naval Committee from seaboard States for every one from an interior State. I do not mean that they are willfully biased in their determination as to what ought to be done.

I submit, Mr. President, that for a great many years a large proportion of the enlisted personnel of the Navy have come from those interior States, whence the men would naturally go to the single interior training station.

Under the management, as the Senator said, of the Secretary of the Navy, who has sailed on the *Henderson* for Japan at the time this reorganization bill is under consideration by the Senate, apprentices for the Navy and newly enlisted men in the Marine Corps were being concentrated at Norfolk and Charleston. I share the view of the Senator from Washington that it was absurd, ludicrous, fantastic, if nothing worse, to abandon permanent buildings at Newport to concentrate apprentices in temporary buildings at Norfolk. The recommendation must

have been approved at a time while the plans for the sailing of the class of 1881 preoccupied the department.

But I submit that if it would be absurd that youth from the North Atlantic States should be sent to Norfolk for their naval training, it is something more absurd to close the training station on the Great Lakes, built upon land given to the Government, and to make it necessary for the mothers and fathers of the young men from the inland States of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin to go to Norfolk or to Newport to see their sons who have offered their services to the Navy.

There are some of us Senators from the inland States who, in the fulfillment of our judgment of what would serve the national interest, have supported measures looking to the maintenance of the American Navy and the reestablishment of the merchant marine, but I think it must be a very dull man who would imagine that he would enhance an understanding of the Navy and interest in the training of naval apprentices throughout the States of the upper Mississippi Valley by abandoning the only naval training station to which the sons of that country could go. I do not know how other Senators from the upper Mississippi Valley may feel, but I know for one that I am perfectly clear that if Secretary Denby or the Navy staff understand so little of human psychology that they think to arouse interest in the Navy by withdrawing from the interior the only station which embodies the Navy and makes it visible to the people of the interior, I can not agree with them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. McCORMICK. Certainly.

Mr. KING. For information I would like to ask the able Senator from Illinois, with whose remarks in the main I entirely agree, about what proportion of the recruits in peace times for naval service come from what might be denominated the interior States and what proportion come from the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific seaboard?

Mr. McCORMICK. If my memory serves me right, in the old days well-nigh half the enlisted personnel of the Navy came from the interior. I have been told within the last few days, by one of the officers attached to the Naval Establishment, that for some strange reason that proportion has seriously changed and that relatively few recruits are coming from the interior. None, as it happens, during the period of their apprenticeship are now stationed at the Great Lakes Station, where the mothers and fathers and sisters can go and see the young men during the period of their schooling.

Mr. KING. May I suggest to the Senator that perhaps one reason for the greater number now coming from the seaboard arises from the fact that there have been numerous discharges from the Navy and from the Army, and perhaps many of them, not having sufficient funds to go home or having had a taste of sea or marine service, immediately reenlist and give their residence perhaps as of the seaboard State rather than the interior. But, without suggesting that as a reason to explain the situation just described, may I ask the Senator whether it is contended that the training obtained at the Great Lakes Station is inadequate or insufficient or is not as good as that which is obtained at Newport?

Mr. McCORMICK. I have never heard that alleged. The Senator knows, I think, that the training in the naval station is precedent to training at sea. It is not long since I stepped aboard a transport and was told by the commanding officer that half of the crew before the mast had never been to sea before. They were about to embark on their first voyage. At the naval training station, as the Senator knows from experience, the training is preliminary and precedent to the training which the enlisted man has at sea.

Mr. KING. That is my understanding. I was wondering if those who are such ardent advocates of having our training stations on the coast urged as a reason for it that they could not get adequate training at the Great Lakes Station.

Mr. McCORMICK. I have never heard that urged. If I am not mistaken the attempted abandonment—I was about to say destruction—of the large and permanent naval stations at Newport and the Great Lakes was determined by the present Secretary of the Navy, but upon whose recommendation I have not been told. It was he who ordered the concentration of all the apprentices in the temporary buildings at Norfolk. I have asked and shall presently receive, so I am advised, a list of the munition dumps and depots, torpedo schools, naval colleges, establishments, wireless schools, and other places for which appropriations are made in the bill.

I think that Senators who will study, for example, the report of the Marine Corps will be perfectly astonished by the distribution of marines, from Vladivostok, where there are 15, to Quantico, where there are 2,500. Any man who will

study that report will ask himself if a joint committee ought not to be appointed to examine stringently into what has been called the management of the Navy. The Navy, militarily, is efficient. Nautically, it is efficient. Under the very able direction of Admiral McGowan the paymaster's service became very efficient. But I am beginning to doubt that that which would be called management, the efficient and economic disposition of its land establishments, is what the country in these days of retrenchment has a right to expect of every department.

I have nothing further to say on the amendment in line 5, but in conjunction with what I have said I shall have an amendment to offer in line 1 on page 16.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am sure the observations just made by the Senator from Illinois must have proven interesting as well as instructing to those Senators who had the opportunity to hear them. I think the Senator's criticisms of what might be denominated the business administration of the Navy are entirely warranted. I had occasion a few moments ago to say that the overhead expenses of the Navy were entirely too great. I called attention to the fact then very briefly that the appropriations, instead of being reduced to such limits as the American people had reason to believe they would be reduced to, had reached the stupendous sum of practically \$300,000,000. The naval appropriation bill in 1903 was only \$78,000,000; in 1904, \$81,000,000; in 1905, \$92,000,000; 1906, \$100,000,000; 1907, 102,000,000; 1908, \$98,000,000; 1909, \$122,000,000; 1910, \$136,000,000; 1911, \$131,000,000; 1912, \$126,000,000; 1913, \$123,000,000; 1914, \$140,000,000; 1915, \$144,000,000; 1916, \$149,000,000.

Then came the war, with, of course, the attendant increase in the naval and military expenditures, but even in 1917, when we were thrust so precipitately into the great World War, the naval expenses were only \$313,000,000. In 1920 they were \$616,000,000; in 1921, \$433,000,000; for 1922 I have not the figures before me, but, as I recall, they were substantially \$400,000,000. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, \$300,000,000 is asked.

The Senator from Illinois has challenged attention to what I conceive to be an evil in the administration of the affairs of the Navy. I hope the Senator from Illinois will move at the appropriate places in the bill to strike out the appropriations for a number of so-called naval bases or stations, and the various schools and camps and stations.

They dot both the Atlantic and the Pacific coast. The Senator has indicated that there is only one State upon the Atlantic coast which has not obtained its share of the plunder.

It was said for many years that the river and harbor bills were framed by log-rolling activities upon the part of the representatives of the people, and that every little creek and rivulet in many of the States received large appropriations. I recall when I had the honor to serve in the House of Representatives, during the discussion of the river and harbor bill before the Committee of the Whole, a State—I shall not now designate it—was named by the Secretary, who was reading the bill. There were a number of items of appropriations for little creeks and streams, known and unknown, in that State, and the Representative who was sitting at my side, attracted by the reading of the name of his State, rose and said that he had never heard of a given stream which was receiving a very large appropriation; it was a small State, too. However, by the process of conciliation and log-rolling, these great appropriation bills, which in the aggregate have taken from the Treasury of the United States more than \$1,000,000,000, have been passed.

Our public building bills have been drawn in the same way; and so we have scattered throughout the United States a large number of buildings in little towns. The Government of the United States has been compelled to pay for their erection, and is now being compelled to pay for their upkeep. So it has been with our Naval Establishment. This bill, carrying \$300,000,000, is a revelation of the extravagance and the waste which have characterized the conduct of the Navy Department and which still persists and reflects itself in many of the items found in the bill. Instead of having a score or two score or perhaps a hundred stations of various kinds—I think the number will be a hundred—why not concentrate into a few, and thus reduce the tremendous and extravagant overhead of the Navy?

We hear a great deal about the economies of the present administration, and every few days we are told that the Budget has saved the country enormous sums. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the Budget as a reducer of expenses of the Government has proven utterly futile. The economies which have been effectuated have resulted from the action of the legislative branch of the Government. Much also is due to the splendid services of Representative MADDEN and much to the fine work of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and

other members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate; but I think that the appropriations are still too great. Instead of keeping within our income, we are advised by the Secretary of the Treasury that the deficit for the fiscal year of 1922 will be approximately \$500,000,000. I make bold to assert that when all of the deficiencies shall have been reported, and all of the appropriations made which will have to be provided in order to meet expenditures for the present year, the deficit will be over \$600,000,000. It is already reported that the expenditures for 1922 will aggregate \$2,831,479,212, plus \$1,393,164,200, and those sums do not include any of the deficiency appropriations which have not yet been reported, although some of them may have been reported, but perhaps not yet acted upon. So, Mr. President, this administration, with the enormous income which is being derived from the heavy taxes which are placed upon the people, will have a deficiency of between five hundred and six hundred million dollars. What the deficiency will be next year no one can determine.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Utah is discussing a subject in which the whole country is interested, and that is the apparent inability of Congress to reduce expenditures. As I view the situation, the figures, as I have studied them, indicate that we have made very little progress, comparatively speaking, none at all. The country is naturally asking and everybody is asking what is the remedy? It is very clear to my mind that so long as we regard the party in power as being responsible for these expenditures we shall never make any progress. It does not make any difference which of the parties is in power, the expenditures continue to rise and taxes continue to increase. I do not say this to raise a partisan question but rather to obviate such a suggestion, for when we consider the expenditures which have been provided for up to this time it is apparent there is no party responsibility for them. Appropriations, many of which, I think, are intolerable and unjustifiable, have been supported from the other side of the Chamber just as eagerly as they have been supported from this side of the Chamber.

Now, so long, Mr. President, as that condition continues, and at the same time the impression is conveyed to the country that the particular administration or party in power is responsible for it, we are not getting the real facts of the situation to the country; and the abuse can not be corrected except through the power of public opinion. Let it be understood when the sum total is made up and the tremendous expenditures are known and the taxes continue to increase that it is not by reason of the action of one party but by reason of the action of both parties here in this Chamber. Neither side of the Chamber has any plan of economy; but both sides of the Chamber are always willing to swell appropriations whenever they have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Idaho will acquit me of any partisanship in the discussion of appropriation bills. The Senator will recall that when the Democratic Party was in power perhaps I was more critical of the appropriations made by it than I have been of the appropriations carried in the bills reported by the present Republican majority, not because I thought the Democratic Party was more censurable than the Republican Party but because I felt that the Democratic Party, with its professions for economy, ought to know better and that it deserved more serious criticism than did the Republican Party. The Democratic Party has made greater professions of economy and efficiency of the administration than has the Republican Party, and I think the Democratic Party is more deserving of censure for extravagant appropriations, if they are made when that party is in power, than is the Republican Party, because the Democrats know better, they are pledged to economy, and they know when they are not economical and not efficient they are violating their platform and the principles upon which the Democratic Party rests.

I agree entirely with the Senator from Idaho that the record of the Democratic Party in the Senate and in the House is not free from criticism by any means upon the question of appropriations; upon these matters I would as quickly condemn my own party for what I regard as extravagance as I would condemn the Republican Party; but I want to say to my good friend from Idaho that the American people have not yet learned what economy is in governmental expenditures. As the Senator knows, we are whipped and spurred by our constituents and by the people throughout the United States to make appropriations upon every conceivable subject.

Mr. BORAH. By a very small portion of them. We get a telegram with reference to an appropriation for a particular part of the country; perhaps it represents a dozen men who

are interested in the proposition; but the other several thousand we do not hear from, and to them we pay no attention. We legislate upon the call of a very small minority when it comes to the question of increasing appropriations. I have no doubt at all that the great mass of people are opposed to large appropriations, and that if the true voice of the people could be ascertained from the entire people it would be against them; but a few telegrams put us in action.

Mr. KING. There is very much in what the Senator says. The brave and courageous men in the Senate—and, of course, it would be unparliamentary for me to refer to those at the other end of the building, in the House of Representatives—are thrown into perturbation when telegrams and letters come demanding appropriations; but I invite the attention of the able Senator from Idaho to the fact that in our municipalities, in our political subdivisions, precincts, counties, school districts, and in our States there has been for the past 10 years a growing tendency toward extravagance and increased appropriations. If the Senator will now pick up the New York newspapers of to-day, or of any day, he will find there advertisements of various bond issues by political subdivisions, by States, by counties, and by school districts. The people seem to feel that they are warranted in bonding themselves and their inheritance and placing yokes and burdens upon their children and their children's children for many years to come.

I put into the RECORD some months ago figures showing the bonded indebtedness of the States and the municipalities and the counties in the United States. The sum is startling because of its magnitude. The bonded indebtedness of the United States, as the Senator knows, is approximately \$24,000,000,000. I think there should be an educational campaign in the interest of public economy. We have not set the example here. The Senate has responded to the demands of executive departments, and the Senator knows that the voracity of the appetite of executives never can be appeased. I venture the assertion that as to the bill before us when the estimates were presented by the representatives of the Navy Department there were demands for two or three hundred million dollars more than are carried by the bill. The executive departments, no matter which party is in power, ask for more and still more; they are never satisfied, and would never be satisfied, no matter what appropriations might be made.

There is some sort of a malignant disease that takes possession of executive officials when they get into office. They want more power, and they want larger appropriations, and they want an extension of their authority; and Congress too freely, too liberally, too quickly responds to their demands, and so the appropriations increase by leaps and bounds. We will appropriate for the coming year perhaps nearly \$4,000,000,000, and then there will be a deficit, and when the bonus bill is passed instead of its being four billions it will probably be six or seven or eight billions of dollars. So the expenses of the Government will increase, and we will proclaim our devotion to economy and to efficiency, but there will be none. It seems as if it were a hopeless task.

If the public will concern themselves in these appropriations, and will scourge the public servants, their Representatives in the House and their Senators, and demand of them economy, and threaten them with political annihilation unless there is economy, we may get it; and if we will curb the rapacity of executive officials, it will be a long step in the direction of economy.

I repeat, I hope that when we reach the appropriate places in the bill the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] will move to strike out the appropriations carried for a multitude of these useless and unnecessary bases for all sorts of things. We can prune this bill of fifty to seventy-five million dollars and leave an adequate amount for an efficient, a scientific, a modern, an up-to-date Navy, such as the American people will be proud of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). The question is on the committee amendment on page 15, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 15, at the end of line 9, to strike out "\$15,701.60" and to insert "\$20,000," so as to make the proviso read:

*Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, drafting inspection, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, shall not exceed \$20,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I see no reason for this increase. The House allowed \$15,701. I presume, however, it will be assigned as a sufficient reason that having increased the general amount from \$125,000 to \$225,000, there ought to be an increase here.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this comes out of the other amount. It does not increase the total. This \$20,000 is a part of what we have just passed on.

Mr. LODGE. It does not increase any appropriation.

Mr. KING. I understand that, but I am trying to limit the amount to be paid to civilian employees.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator no doubt has examined the bill carefully and is familiar with its provisions; and, if so, he will have noticed that corresponding to the increase of \$5,000 on page 15 there is a decrease of \$5,000 on page 16, so that it leaves the total exactly as it was before.

Mr. KING. Yes; but the point I had in mind, if the Senator will pardon me, is that all through this bill we find such large amounts, according to my view, devoted to clerical help, so much paid for overhead. These few thousands here—\$5,000 in this place and \$10,000 in another place, for clerks and overhead, and so on—in the aggregate make a very large sum. I think we ought to prune.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 16, line 1, to increase the appropriation for maintenance of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station from "\$160,000" to "\$200,000."

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the committee by striking out "\$200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$350,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the committee, "\$200,000," it is proposed to insert "\$350,000."

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that the increase made here is all that was asked for by the Navy Department and all that was asked for by the colleague of the Senator from Illinois in the amendment which he proposed before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCORMICK. What was the item submitted by the Budget?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Three hundred and sixty thousand dollars.

Mr. McCORMICK. Was that asked by the department?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not in the hearings before the committee. I will read the Senator what was asked.

Mr. McCORMICK. Presumably that was a figure which the Director of the Budget did not force on the department.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The testimony of Admiral Washington before the committee was that—

It is hardly practicable to get along with that amount—

That is, referring to the amount allowed by the House—

and carry on the schools which we hope to carry on, namely, radio and aviation schools at Chicago.

The principal item is coal, and I think an increase of \$40,000 over what the House allowed us would be sufficient to meet our needs.

So we added that \$40,000 and made the total \$200,000 upon the motion of the Senator's colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McCORMICK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Illinois as to the amount that has been appropriated for a number of years past for the training station at Great Lakes?

Mr. McCORMICK. Last year the amount was \$400,000. This is \$50,000 less than last year, whereas the amount proposed to be appropriated for Newport, and appropriated under the decision of the Senate, is \$30,000 more than last year.

Mr. KING. While I concede that there is perhaps no proper basis for comparison, I should like to inquire of the Senator approximately the amount appropriated in 1915, 1916, and 1917 for naval training.

Mr. McCORMICK. I am not able to tell the Senator. As he knows, the establishment has been very much enlarged since that time.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. I am frank to say that if there is to be but one concentration of apprentices in this country, in view of the one hundred and some naval establishments running from Bremerton to Key West and from Key West to Kittery, I should

think we in the interior might be given a glimpse of our common Navy at the Great Lakes Station.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question. I understood him to say that this amount of \$200,000 was appropriated because it was the amount asked for by the department. Is that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I did not say it was appropriated because it was asked for, but I said that it was asked for and that the committee was of the opinion that it should be appropriated.

Mr. BORAH. What I meant to say was the committee conformed to their request?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. Of course, we considered the purpose for which it was asked. We went very carefully into the purpose for which it was to be used. There is a radio school there and an aviation school.

I may say, in regard to this naval training station at Great Lakes, that it is very largely the product of the war, like many other establishments that we are now trying to reduce.

This bill as it stands on the report of your committee carries \$200,000, however, for this training school, as against \$125,000 for the entire Pacific coast and \$260,000 for Hampton Roads and \$225,000 for Newport; and I fail to see any very great discrimination or discrepancy between those allowances.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the Senator from Washington explain why, in his judgment, it is appropriate to increase the appropriation for Newport as compared with last year and to decrease that for Great Lakes?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Because of the fact that the increase of \$100,000 at Newport was demonstrated to be necessary to operate the permanent buildings there.

Mr. McCORMICK. Are the buildings at Great Lakes any less permanent than those at Newport?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Much less permanent so far as a great number of them are concerned.

Mr. McCORMICK. How many men will the permanent buildings at Newport house, and how many men will the permanent buildings at Great Lakes house?

Mr. POINDEXTER. They will house a great many, but they will house 2,500 at Newport.

Mr. McCORMICK. How many at Great Lakes?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Probably equally as many.

Mr. McCORMICK. Why should there be the distinction?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am informed that the number of men estimated as capable of being housed in the permanent buildings at Great Lakes is 1,800. A radio school and an aviation school are being conducted there.

Mr. McCORMICK. How many men are there in those two schools now?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There are 400 men there in those schools.

Mr. McCORMICK. There is room for 1,400 more men there, then. It is an interesting coincidence.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before the Senator sits down, it does not seem to me that the true test here is whether or not this appropriation compares with that for Newport, but the question is, How much is really needed? According to the statement of the Senator from Washington, the committee has already appropriated all that could be used.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Idaho that if the Secretary of the Navy determines to keep these apprentices in the shacks at Norfolk, not a dollar of the increased appropriation will be needed at Newport. It may very well be that he will take that view, even though he has no high opinion of the judgment of the Senate. It will take approximately the sum of \$350,000 if he orders to Great Lakes as many apprentices as it can comfortably house.

Mr. BORAH. I am willing to go back to Newport and keep down the amount to \$125,000, but I am not willing, if we made a mistake on Newport, to make a second mistake on Great Lakes; and the question is not what we did with reference to Newport, but whether this increased amount is really needed at Great Lakes. As I understand, the Senator's colleague [Mr. McKINLEY] moved for this amount in the committee upon the hearings, and upon the motion of the Senator's colleague, based upon the evidence, the amount was made \$200,000.

Mr. McCORMICK. Yes; and that presumed the abandonment of the apprentice school at Great Lakes. For one I am not willing to assent to the proposition that apprentice seamen enlisted in the interior shall all be ordered to Norfolk or Newport or San Diego. It would be just as sound and more sound to order the seaboard apprentices to the interior, in view of the establishments—one hundred and some—which are maintained from Bremerton to Key West, and from Key West to Newport, as I have said.

Mr. BORAH. I think if the boys had their choice they would likely want to go just as far away from their homes to get their education as they could. That is the general experience that we have.

Mr. McCORMICK. Of course there is an establishment at Vladivostok.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and I understand that we are maintaining it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] to the amendment of the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been called for and ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assisant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW], and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL (after having voted in the negative). I find that my general pair, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], has not voted. So I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. DU PONT], and let my vote stand.

Mr. EDGE (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLES], and let my vote stand.

Mr. ERNST. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD], and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on official business.

Mr. COLT. Has the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted?

Mr. COLT. In his absence, as I have a general pair with that Senator, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. RAWSON], and vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. MYERS. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and vote "nay."

Mr. KING. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] is paired with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. Both Senators are necessarily absent from the Chamber.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 37, as follows:

| YEAS—17.      |              |            |              |
|---------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Bursum        | Gooding      | McKinley   | Shortridge   |
| Cameron       | Harrel       | McNary     | Willis       |
| Ernst         | Johnson      | Oddie      |              |
| France        | Lodge        | Pomerene   |              |
| Frelinghuysen | McCormick    | Sheppard   |              |
| NAYS—37.      |              |            |              |
| Ashurst       | Glass        | Myers      | Sutherland   |
| Ball          | Harris       | Newberry   | Swanson      |
| Borah         | Heflin       | Overman    | Townsend     |
| Broussard     | Hitchcock    | Philpps    | Underwood    |
| Capper        | Jones, Wash. | Pittman    | Walsh, Mass. |
| Caraway       | Kendrick     | Poindester | Warren       |
| Curtis        | King         | Ransdell   | Watson, Ind. |
| Dial          | Ladd         | Smoot      |              |
| Edge          | La Follette  | Spencer    |              |
| Gerry         | McCumber     | Sterling   |              |

## NOT VOTING—42.

|            |                |           |              |
|------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Brandegee  | Hale           | Nicholson | Smith        |
| Calder     | Harrison       | Norbeck   | Stanfield    |
| Colt       | Jones, N. Mex. | Norris    | Stanley      |
| Crow       | Kellogg        | Owen      | Trammell     |
| Culberson  | Keyes          | Page      | Wadsworth    |
| Cummins    | Lenroot        | Pepper    | Walsh, Mont. |
| Dillingham | McKellar       | Rawson    | Watson, Ga.  |
| du Pont    | McLean         | Reed      | Weller       |
| Elkins     | Moses          | Robinson  | Williams     |
| Fernald    | Nelson         | Shields   |              |
| Fletcher   | New            | Simmons   |              |

So Mr. McCORMICK's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 11, to reduce the appropriation for maintenance of Naval Training Station at Naval Operating Base, Virginia, Hampton Roads, Va., from "\$360,000" to "\$260,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, at the end of line 15, to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$20,000," so as to make the proviso read:

*Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, shall not exceed \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Reserve Force," on page 16, line 20, after the word "wharfage," to strike out "\$50,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated in this act shall be used for the training of any member of the Naval Reserve Force except with his own consent," and to insert, "pay and allowances of officers and enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force, other than class 1, while on active duty for training; mileage for officers while traveling under orders to and from active duty for training; transportation of enrolled men to and from active duty for training, and subsistence and transfers en route or cash in lieu thereof; subsistence of enrolled men during the actual period of active duty for training; pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve Force and pay, allowances, and subsistence of enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force when ordered to active duty in connection with the instruction, training, and drilling of the Naval Reserve Force; and retainer pay of officers and enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force, other than class 1, \$3,000,000, which amount shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for fuel and transportation and for all expenses in connection with the maintenance, operation, repair, and upkeep of vessels assigned for training the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided*, That members of the Volunteer Naval Reserve may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be issued such articles of uniform as may be required for their drills and training, the value thereof to be charged against the clothing and small-stores fund: *Provided further*, That no part of the money appropriated in this act shall be used for the training of any member of the Naval Reserve Force except with his own consent," so as to read:

For expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia; for the maintenance and rental of armories, including the pay of necessary janitors, and for wharfage, pay and allowances of officers and enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force, etc.

Mr. BORAH. I would like to ask a question of the Senator having the bill in charge. I do not understand this amendment. Is it an increase in the appropriation over the House appropriation from \$50,000 to \$3,000,000?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is.

Mr. BORAH. I wish the Senator would explain the necessity for that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. My understanding is that the opinion of the framers of the bill in the House was that the matter of training the Naval Reserve ought to be left until such time as the entire establishment of the Naval Reserve was reorganized by new legislation, which will probably have to be done. It was thought by the Senate committee, however, that rather than forego entirely the training of the Naval Reserve in the coming fiscal year, which would be the result of following the policy just stated, we would make appropriations for that in this bill. The amount of \$3,000,000 we considered a very modest amount for the purpose of training 10,000 enlisted men and 3,000 officers in the reserve.

Mr. KING. I would like a little further explanation from the Senator. Is there a general law which authorizes the course which this bill seems to prescribe?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is.

Mr. KING. What was the amount expended last year for this, and how many responded, both enlisted men and reserve officers?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There was no training last year at all. Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator that I have received three letters, one from an officer and two from men, claiming that this was a good deal of a farce. I express no opinion, because I do not know enough about it to justify me having an opinion. One officer who wrote me stated that it was just a holiday, that he had a delightful time. As I recall, he went a year or two ago, down on the Pacific somewhere, down toward Peru, and obtained very good compensation, as he stated, far more than he was receiving at home. He rather protested against it, and claimed that the Government was not receiving a quid quo pro.

It would seem to me that the greater part of this appropriation would be consumed in paying the traveling expenses of the enlisted men from the interior, or wherever they lived, to the boats and back home. May I inquire of the Senator how it operates and whether any good has resulted from the system?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is the judgment of most competent officers that the training of these men for periods of two weeks in naval discipline and naval instruction is of the utmost value. Men responding to this opportunity for training put themselves under obligation to be taken into the naval service of the country in case of emergency or in case of war, so that we create here, for comparatively small expense, a large force of partially trained men. Of course we can not train them completely in this short time.

I would not attach very much importance, I may say to the Senator from Utah, to the statement of an officer who took part in this training and then said that it did not amount to anything, that the Government was not getting anything out of it, but that he had a pleasant cruise. Any man who goes into it and does his duty will do a great deal more than that. He is bound to get some benefit for himself if he does the work outlined for him and obeys the orders given to him, or if he is an officer and gives proper instruction to the men under him. On the face of it, a comment of that kind from a man who served as an officer in the training of the Naval Reserve condemns its author and falls of its own weight, in my opinion.

We have had a great deal of experience with the matter, and it is the universal opinion of those who are capable of judging that very great benefit is derived from the training of the men.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the Senator how many officers in any one year have availed themselves of this provision of the law, and also the highest number of men who have availed themselves of it?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not able to give the Senator the figures as to all the previous years, but it is hoped and expected that there will be 3,000 officers and 10,000 men who will attend for training this year. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is scarcely any precedent of value in view of the fact that prior to the war the Naval Establishment, so far as ships and tonnage and men were concerned, was very small as compared with even that provided for in this bill; that during the war all of the activities of training of Naval Reserves were suspended, and that in the reorganization and reestablishment which has been going on since the war they have also been interrupted. So we are practically starting upon a new system, which will, as I said a moment ago, call for a revision of the law relating to the Naval Reserve and putting it, we hope, upon a more economical basis.

We carry a great many men now upon practically retired pay, which list is being constantly added to. It is one of those very liberal and generous provisions which came out of the spirit of generosity and liberality, if not extravagance, which characterized the people during the war and following the war. There will be need for revision of the law to come back to normal conditions.

Mr. KING. How much is paid to the officers and how much is paid to the men? I do not mean in the aggregate, but to each.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of the items of pay, the men and officers will receive \$1,165,682. The mileage of officers will be \$77,680. The active-duty ship keepers, \$304,286; provisions for ship keepers, \$109,500. Rent of armories, which is rather a misnomer, because we really have no armories and will have to acquire rooms where the men will meet and put on uniforms and undergo drill and where they can get some shelter, \$250,000. There will be a small number of officers on active duty and there is \$51,926 provided for them. For pay of all men for 17 days—that is, counting 15 days of actual training and a day going and a day coming—\$715,000; for provisions for men during the

period of training, \$75,000; and for fuel for the operation of the ships upon which the training will be given, \$250,000.

Mr. KING. That means practically, if I follow the Senator, that the officers get the major portion of it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The officers get very little of it. I have not the segregated figures, but it is a mere matter of clerical computation. Pay of 3,000 officers during two weeks and pay of 10,000 men during the same period can easily be figured out. Each class of men will get what is allowed that class under the provisions of the pay law which was recently enacted by Congress.

Mr. KING. The Senator gave an item of one million several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That was for officers and men, retainer pay—one month's retainer pay for officers and men.

Mr. KING. Then the men receive, in addition to the \$715,000 for 17 days' pay, retainer pay for one month?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. KING. And the officers receive retainer pay for one month?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is true.

Mr. KING. And then pay for 17 days?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. Of course, the retainer pay is fixed by law for the various classes of the naval reserves. The purpose of it is to compensate men for putting themselves under the obligation of responding to the call of the country in case of an emergency or in case of war.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether that retainer pay is given to the men prior to or after the service of 17 days, because if we pay in advance we may not get the 17 days' service.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What was the Senator's question?

Mr. KING. Is the retainer pay of one month given to the man in advance of the actual 17 days' service?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not at all. It is given to him only when he responds and volunteers for the service.

Mr. KING. There is no question about that, I understand?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is no question about it.

Mr. KING. And they draw the same compensation as if they were in the Navy? If they bear the grade of captain or admiral, they get a month and 17 days' pay of a captain or admiral or whatever rank they may hold?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. I imagine there will be no admirals and probably very few captains, but whatever rank or grade they occupy, they will get one month's pay as a retainer and in addition to that will get 17 days' pay of the grade which they hold.

Mr. KING. Then the proposition is simply, as I understand it, that 10,000 men and more than 1,000 officers are to be paid, under existing law—and this bill carries the appropriation—one month's compensation each year and compensation for 17 days' service, for the 17 days they are absent from their homes. In other words, to get them to give 17 days' service each year we pay them for the 17 days and in addition to that one month's compensation. It may be worth it, but I confess I am not able to perceive it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to ask one more question of the Senator from Washington. He may have answered it, but I did not hear it. What reason was assigned by the House for not putting this item in the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The reason was that the law relating to the Naval Reserve will soon be revised and there ought to be a general revision, and they preferred to wait and have a special appropriation bill for the training of the Naval Reserve. The only difference of opinion in that respect between the Senate committee and the House committee is that the Senate committee recommends that the appropriation be made in this bill, notwithstanding the prospective revision of the Naval Reserve act.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator to put this item over until to-morrow and give me a chance to examine into it a little further. If we take a vote now I may be compelled to move to reconsider. I have no objection to taking a vote on it now, if the Senator will consent to permit a motion to reconsider to-morrow in the event I desire to reopen the question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was in hopes that we might go on with the matter and dispose of it.

Mr. KING. I have no objection. I merely ask that the vote on this particular item may go over until to-morrow, or, if the Senator desires to take a vote now, that I may make a motion to-morrow to reconsider if I shall be so advised.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That will be entirely satisfactory. Let us take the vote, and then, if the Senator desires to reopen it, he can make his motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Washington with respect to the item providing for "Naval War College, Rhode Island"? It is not subject to amendment under the present method of procedure; but what is the necessity of maintaining the Naval War College there or of making this appropriation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Naval War College at Newport has been established for a number of years and is regarded by a great many men, such as Admiral Sims, for instance, who is at the head of it at the present time, as the most valuable institution in the Navy. It is the only school in the Navy which trains officers in the art of war. The purpose of it is to give a post-graduate course to officers of the Navy in the strategy and tactics of naval campaigns and battles. There will be found there taking this course commanders and admirals. The college at Newport is regarded as having proved its usefulness by the interest which it has created among the officers of the Navy and by the improvement which they have received from the course which they have there taken.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I concede the wisdom and the propriety of having such a post-graduate school, but it occurred to me that we have the War College here at Washington, as the Senator knows, and, though its functions are somewhat different, it might be amplified to embrace the work of the institution at Newport—

Mr. POINDEXTER. That has been suggested.

Mr. KING. And thereby save the expense of having another college in some other place. The most expert men are here at the War College; they are up to date on all modern naval warfare and its technique; and it occurred to me that it would be better to concentrate and have one splendid naval war college.

Mr. POINDEXTER. But, of course, the War College here relates to warfare on land.

Mr. LODGE. The War College here has to do with the Army.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will allow me, the War College at Newport is a naval war college, while the War College here in Washington is an Army war college. The War College in Newport has been established, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has stated, for a great many years. The officers who undergo instruction there pursue a course of intensive study. I do not know whether the Senator from Utah has ever seen the war games, but the officers at Newport work out maneuvers on a board and then try them out practically with the fleet. It has really been a great source of strategic naval development.

Apart from that, the college at Newport is utilized to its full capacity, as I think the War College is in Washington; and it would really be an additional expense, even supposing that it were a practical proposition, to try to enlarge the War College here and to do away with the Naval College at Newport, where all necessary facilities have been provided. If the idea of the Senator from Utah is one of economy, I feel sure he is going in the opposite direction if he advocates the abandonment of the Naval War College at Newport.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Naval Observatory, salaries, Navy Department," on page 23, line 11, before the word "two," to strike out "two at \$1,400 each" and insert "one \$1,400," so as to read:

Astronomers—1 \$3,200, 1 \$2,800; assistant astronomers—1 \$2,400, 1 \$2,000, 1 \$1,800; assistant in department of nautical instruments, \$1,600; clerks—chief \$2,000, 1 \$1,800, 1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,400.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate very briefly in regard to the amendments proposed by the committee reducing the number of employees provided by the House bill for the Naval Observatory and the Nautical Almanac. The provisions made by the House are very moderate. The Nautical Almanac and the Naval Observatory perform a service of the very highest value. They are engaged in activities which are essential, and they are as free from overhead expenses, to which my friend from Utah [Mr. KING] is fond of objecting, as are any institutions of which I know in the Navy or in any other department of the Government. I have therefore secured some facts in regard to these two adjuncts to the naval service which I wish to lay briefly before the Senate.

Mr. KING. To what specific item is the Senator from Massachusetts referring?

Mr. LODGE. I am referring to the amendments reported by the committee affecting the Naval Observatory and the Nautical Almanac. I am going to consider them both together. In my

judgment, there ought to be no reduction in the appropriations for either the Naval Observatory or the Nautical Almanac below those provided by the House. The economies that are proposed to be effectuated by the amendments of the Senate committee are trifling, while the work which these two great organizations perform is absolutely vital to the naval service; and it is performed at a lower rate of cost than similar work is performed at the observatory at Greenwich or at any other foreign observatory. I may add also that a larger amount of work is done.

The first amendment to which I desire to call attention is, on page 23, line 11, where the committee propose to reduce the number of clerks at \$1,400 in the Naval Observatory from two to one. From the statement which has been furnished to me it appears that—

this clerk is needed to keep up with current work in the material business of the Bureau of Navigation which is done at the observatory. The effective number of clerks has not been increased over the 1915 standard, because then two clerks were borrowed from other branches and enlisted clerical force was available. They did not show on this appropriation. This arrangement is no longer permitted. Business has much increased since 1915.

It seems that they have dispensed with some of the clerical assistance in that particular office; and I do not think there ought to be any further reduction.

The next amendment to which I desire to refer is on page 23, line 13, which proposes to reduce the number of assistants from three at \$1,600 each to two at \$1,600 each, and from three at \$1,400 each to two at \$1,400 each, a reduction of one in each class.

These "assistants" are astronomers in the making. The cut results in taking off one observer (who also does high-class computing) from each of two principal astronomical instruments. These men represent a considerable Government investment in the years of training they have received here for the work needed. Or else the \$1,600 cut results in removing the acting head of the computing division, to whom the same statement applies. None can be spared.

On page 23, line 16, one fireman is eliminated, the number being reduced from four to three; the number of watchmen is reduced from seven to five, and the number of laborers from eight to six. In connection with this proposed reduction the statement to which I have heretofore referred says:

There are now four firemen. Out of 46 buildings scattered over 62 acres, 18 buildings are heated by the central plant. These men handle coal, look after pumps, boilers, piping, plumbing, etc., and also run motor lawn mowers. The Government allows each 30 days' leave a year, and more if he gets sick. Under these conditions three firemen as a total can not do the work, and with only three allowed it is not possible to obtain reliable men at the low wage offered.

Similar reasons apply to the need for the present seven watchmen. The guarding of separate buildings containing astronomical apparatus, and valuable stocks of navigational instruments, from fire and theft, the work by night adjusting shutters to instrument houses, etc., and attendance at the telephone switchboard can not be adequately done under the reduction. Nor can the reduced number of laborers accomplish the necessary upkeep efficiently.

On page 23, line 22, the item of \$5,000 for miscellaneous computations in astronomy is stricken out.

"Miscellaneous computations" covers the pay of four to five computers, whose duty is to do the routine computing resulting from the observations made on the various instruments.

Of course, without the necessary computations the observations are valueless—

One (and sometimes two, as occasion demands) computes for the chronometer and time service. The higher class of computation work is done by the observers. The miscellaneous computation fund has remained stationary at \$5,000 since 1915 but covers less work than at that time, due to the impossibility now of obtaining workers at the 1915 rate of wages. The deprivation of this \$5,000 so slows the results obtainable from the observations as to throw the work seriously in arrears. Moreover, it removes the source of supply for juniors who act as assistants in the time service and at the instruments to fill temporary vacancies, and who must be relied on to fill the higher places later in life. The restoration of the sum for miscellaneous computations is vital to the production of astronomical results.

The amendments propose a cut of 30 per cent in the department of observations (astronomical), and the number at present employed is fewer than the work demands. The table shows the totals.

I ask to have the table printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

|   | 1915 | 1922 | Proposed by amendments. |
|---|------|------|-------------------------|
| Professors of mathematics (U. S. Navy)..... | 2    | 2    | 2                       |
| Astronomers.....                            | 2    | 2    | 2                       |
| Assistant astronomers.....                  | 3    | 3    | 3                       |
| Assistants.....                             | 8    | 6    | 4                       |
| Miscellaneous computers.....                | 5    | 1    | 1                       |
| Time service.....                           | 1    | 1    | 1                       |
| Librarian.....                              | 1    | 1    | 1                       |
| Total.....                                  | 19   | 19   | 13                      |

Mr. LODGE. As to the amendment on page 24, line 18, which reduces from \$6,500 to \$5,000 the appropriation "for cleaning, repair, and upkeep of grounds and roads," the following statement is made:

The Naval Observatory grounds are maintained as a park in the city of Washington. The roads are mostly for public use. Some are thoroughfares. Whether they can be satisfactorily maintained a credit to the Government for a less sum than hitherto remains to be proved. The larger sum is recommended.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to describe briefly the work of the Naval Observatory. I presume all Senators have seen it:

The Naval Observatory is a large and expensive plant in which the Government has a heavy investment. The purpose for which it was established is best served by utilizing a sufficient personnel to carry on the work efficiently. A less personnel causes, for the sake of a small assumed economy, a definite loss on the investment.

I ask the attention of the Senate to the following statement:

The product of the Naval Observatory is:

- (a) Time signals.
- (b) The Nautical Almanac (salaries in another special appropriation).
- (c) Astronomical observations for position of heavenly bodies (used for time signals, for Nautical Almanac, and for scientific investigations).
- (d) Navigation instruments for naval vessels and aircraft.

Such instruments are cared for and regulated at the observatory.

The time for the United States comes from the Naval Observatory. With time signals twice daily, by cooperation of the Naval Radio Service, the observatory is in communication with every naval vessel at sea in the Atlantic and also with thousands of merchant vessels. It gives them that exact time without which they can not safely navigate and without which, in war, location of rendezvous at sea would be impossible. By cooperation of the telegraph companies the time is flashed across the land at noon, and is of inestimable value to science, commerce, and the industries. This time service is acknowledged abroad to be among the best. Australia has used these time signals to determine State boundaries in longitude.

To insure the requisite accuracy in nautical almanacs requires continuous and numerous astronomical observations of the sun, moon, planets, and stars. This astronomy of position is the main business of the department of observations at the Naval Observatory and of a few observatories of other governments. The Naval Observatory carries on continuously the heavy and tedious labor of determining the accurate positions of the heavenly bodies and the fundamental astronomical constants upon which all investigations in astronomy depend. This is not work usually done by other than government observatories. The amount of such work now being done in the world is insufficient for astronomical needs. The quota expected from the United States should not be diminished.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the following comparison between the United States Naval Observatory and the Greenwich Observatory, England:

In the year 1920—the latest official data available—comparison with Greenwich Observatory, England, shows 16 observers and 14 computers there, the Naval Observatory at Washington having only 12 observers and 6 computers. Comparison of cost and output shows efficiency and economy. The meridian circle is one of the important instruments in astronomy of position. In 1920 Greenwich made 9,735 observations and the Naval Observatory 9,601. There are nine important astronomical instruments in operation at the Naval Observatory.

I shall not weary the Senate by reading the remainder of the description of the work of the observatory, but I ask that it may be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The star places now in use for the determination of time, longitude, and latitude are based on observations made 25 and more years ago. This observatory, as well as others, has a large amount of material available for the improvement of the star places. Such an improvement is being demanded constantly by astronomers, by the requirements of the time signals, and by survey work. Any curtailment of the present force of the observatory and almanac hinders the observatory in meeting the present demands for better modern star places, data which it is its distinct province to furnish. In other words, the data which the observatory will accumulate as one of the results of its observations from now on for the next 25 years will be the foundation for the next set of star catalogues. If the observations cease, this country will have no data available at that time and other sources of information must be sought.

A single program of astronomical work often takes many years to carry out. The kind of work done at the Naval Observatory requires a larger number of employees than the kinds of work done in many astronomical observatories. It is a difficult matter to recruit such personnel, as there are comparatively few to select from. The experience and training of these employees represent a considerable expenditure on the part of the Government. They are of recognized standing among the scientific men of the country and are well qualified to reflect credit upon the observatory and to efficiently and capably make the contributions which the world expects this Government to make to this important utilitarian branch of astronomy. They are underpaid, as can be seen from the Government scheme of reclassification.

The rating of chronometers and timepieces for naval vessels and aircraft and the repair and development of navigational instruments done at the Naval Observatory is correlated with the astronomical work. It is in the interest of economy to utilize the facilities and the talent there provided, and a large saving of costs results.

The administration of the material business of the Bureau of Navigation is handled at the Naval Observatory. Such material runs from a \$30,000 gyro compass installation in a dreadnaught to a toy balloon for measuring air currents. Timepieces, sextants, binoculars, and other portable instruments are held in reserve stock here. The clerical and storekeeping work is voluminous.

The foregoing is a general description of the principal work carried on in this establishment. Many of the activities attract little notice despite their essential value, and some are not well understood without close study. Visitors and inquirers are welcomed at the Naval Observatory.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the principal business of the Naval Observatory of the United States is the "astronomy of position," as it is called. It is strictly utilitarian. Of course, great discoveries have been made there; but the activities of the observatory are not purely scientific; they are eminently utilitarian. The work of the observatory is of the greatest possible service to every railroad, to every merchant vessel, to every naval vessel, and to all the business of the world. I ask to print at this point a list of apparatus, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

A list of the principal astronomical apparatus and the principal work of each instrument is appended.

WORK ASSIGNED TO ASTRONOMICAL INSTRUMENTS AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL OBSERVATORY.

Twenty-six-inch equatorial (Professor Hall and Mr. Bower): Observations of satellites of the planets for improving the tables given in the American Ephemeris and for determining the masses of the planets for improving the planetary tables. Occultations of stars by the moon for improving the lunar tables. Eclipses of Jupiter's satellites for testing uniformity of the earth's rotation period. Observations of asteroids and comets for determination of orbits.

Twelve-inch equatorial (Professor Hall, Mr. Peters, and Mr. Bower): Observations of bright comets and asteroids and occultations of stars by the visitors on the regular visitors' night.

Photographic equatorial (Mr. Peters): Observations of asteroids in a selected zone, for the purpose of keeping track of these objects and to furnish positions for improved orbits.

Photoheliograph (Mr. Peters): Daily photographs of the sun near noon for recording the sun spots and studying their relation to magnetic phenomena, electric storms, and auroras, including disturbances affecting telegraph and cable lines. The Western Union Telegraph Co. and Bureau of Engineering of the Navy Department are cooperating in this work. Telegraph and cable companies depend on results here to know when to take precautions against heavy induced currents, thus saving damage and expense due to destruction of their cables.

Six-inch transit circle (Mr. Hammond and Mr. Watts): Observations of standard stars, sun, Venus, and Mercury for the purpose of improving their positions—a series of approximately 50,000 observations extending over eight years is now completed. Its reduction is approaching completion and will soon be ready for publication. Determinations of time for the use of the time service in sending out daily time signals.

Nine-inch transit circle (Mr. Morgan, Mr. Burton, Mr. Pawling, and Mr. Raynsford): Observations of intermediary stars by which reference stars to be used in reducing photographic plates are to be determined, and in connection with this observation of standard stars, sun, moon, and planets. Present program was begun in 1913 and will be completed in two years.

Prime vertical (Mr. Hill): Observations of transits over the prime vertical for the determination of the nutation constant, the aberration constant, the variation of latitude; also the declinations of certain stars with especial reference to determining their proper motions. A series of observations extending over 19 years is completed and the results will soon be ready for publication.

Photographic zenith tube (Professor Littell, Mr. Wise, and Mr. Willis): Observations of stars very near the zenith for determining the variation of latitude and the constant of aberration of light. The variation of latitude, as determined by this instrument, is necessary for the reduction of observations made with the transit circles at this observatory. The observations for variation of latitude should be carried on continuously at this place.

Alt-azimuth (Professor Littell and Mr. Wise): Observations of standard stars and the sun for the improvement of their declinations. Long job, 10 years (2 years done).

Mr. LODGE. I think work of the character of that performed by the Naval Observatory ought to be done in the most efficient and accurate manner. It is done now with a higher degree of efficiency and at a lower cost than in any of the other observatories for which I have been able to obtain figures. I have taken, of course, Greenwich as the most famous observatory in the world.

I wish now to say a word about the Nautical Almanac Office. It is proposed in that case to strike out some of the assistants and greatly to reduce the very moderate amounts given by the House.

The duties of the Nautical Almanac Office are twofold: The publication of the annual volumes of the American Ephemeris—which gives the positions of the planets and is absolutely essential to navigation—and the Nautical Almanac, which, of course, as its name implies, is equally essential to every man who goes to sea. The safety of navigation depends on these publications.

The American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac must be published and distributed prior to the beginning of the year to the navigators of ships, surveyors, and astronomers, in whatever part of the world they may be. This book is now a volume of 800 pages, 30 per cent larger than a few years ago.

Here is a point which I think the committee must have overlooked, and that is the agreement we have made with other nations to carry on this work.

Congress in 1912 authorized the exchange of data with foreign almanac offices—

With a view to reducing the amount of duplication of work in preparing the different national nautical and astronomical almanacs and increasing the total data which may be of use to navigators and astronomers available for publication in the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac.

A proviso was adopted providing for the employment of certain men in that work.

The arrangement thus authorized has been entered into with Great Britain, France, Germany, and Spain. It should be noticed that this arrangement had for its purpose increasing the information available for navigators and astronomers without increasing the expenses of the various national almanac offices. Any cut in the force immediately curtails the work that can be done in improving the tables of the planets, moon, and stars.

I think to economize on an international agreement of that kind is not only very poor economy indeed—for the amounts are trifling—but it is not living up to our agreements. I think we ought to live up to our agreements of that kind with other nations from whom we are receiving very valuable information. In short, Mr. President, I confess that I am surprised by, and I greatly regret, the amendments made by the Senate committee in regard to the Observatory and the Nautical Almanac Office. They are run with the utmost economy now. I am satisfied of that; in fact, it is demonstrated by the fact that the House accepted these amounts. They are run with great efficiency. To that I can testify from years of knowledge in regard to the work; and I wish very much the committee would be willing to consider those reductions again before taking a final vote.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator there that he might call the attention of the committee to the expense to which the Government has been put for carrying on this work for the last number of years.

From 1883 to 1915 it appears that there were 10 persons employed, with appropriations of from \$6,000 to \$8,600 for piecework.

From 1916 to 1920 there were 12 persons employed, with only \$3,000 appropriated for piecework.

From 1921 to 1922 there were only 11 persons employed, with \$1,500 for piecework.

Now the committee proposes to cut this down about a third more.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad the Senator put in those figures. They are very illustrative. They show that there have been no increases here.

Mr. DIAL. The cut now is to a point about a third under the lowest amount there has been.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. DIAL. The amount now is the smallest amount that has been appropriated in a generation for this great work.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and the work is of such enormous importance, not only to the Navy—because there they take care, as I have said, of all the naval instruments, and regulate all the chronometers—but the observations and information furnished by the Nautical Almanac are the sailing directions of all our commerce, and are largely used by other nations. There are very few departments of work undertaken by the Government which have the general value that the Naval Observatory and the Nautical Almanac have to the business and commerce of the world.

There are few Senators present, and nobody has paid much attention to what I have been saying. That, no doubt, is my fault. I have not said it in a sufficiently fascinating way, I suppose; but I should like to appeal to the committee to let this matter go over and consider it a little further before they make these cuts, which are really trivial in comparison to the great sums which we are appropriating here—very properly, I think, for I am thoroughly in favor of the bill, and of all that we have done—but I dislike exceedingly to see these cuts voted. No increase is asked for. These are all reductions of the House appropriations. The total amount involved is very small, and it is reducing the appropriations for one of the most important branches of our Government service.

In connection with the amendments concerning the Nautical Almanac and American Ephemeris, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an official statement from the Superintendent of the United States Naval Observatory.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVAL OBSERVATORY, June 13, 1922.

STATEMENT CONCERNING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO NAUTICAL ALMANAC APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1923.

H. R. 11228 (Rept. No. 762), in the Senate, April 20, 1922. (See pp. 24, 25.)

The following amendments are proposed by the Senate Appropriations Committee to the appropriations for the Nautical Almanac Office carried in the Navy Department appropriation bill as reported to the Senate June 10, 1922:

Strike out "one assistant at \$1,400, two assistants at \$1,200; for pay of computers on piecework, \$1,500." This is a cut of 33½ per cent in personnel.

The present civilian force of the office is 11 assistants, with the addition represented by \$1,500 for piecework. The present force is the result of reductions of 15 per cent made two years ago in the interest of efficiency and economy. The force is now less than it has been for a generation.

The table shows the force appropriated for in the Nautical Almanac Office for past years:

|  | 1883-1915       | 1916-1920 | 1921-22 |
|--|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| Number of assistants.....  | 10              | 12        | 11      |
| Allotment for pieceworkers.....                                  | \$5,000-\$8,600 | \$3,000   | \$1,500 |
| Equivalent total expressed in terms of number of assistants..... | 15              | 14        | 12      |

The present force is under the supervision and direction of a professor of mathematics (United States Navy), who is a theoretical and practical astronomer of ability and long experience.

The cuts in personnel contemplated will reduce the product of the Nautical Almanac Office to a damaging extent and injure the usefulness of the office and its international repute.

The duties of the almanac office are twofold—the publication of the annual volumes of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac, and improving the tables of the planets, moon, and stars which are used in preparing the annual volumes.

The American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac must be published and distributed prior to the beginning of the year to the navigators of ships, surveyors, and astronomers in whatever part of the world they may be. This book is now a volume of 800 pages—30 per cent larger than a few years ago.

On August 22, 1912, Congress authorized the exchange of data with foreign almanac offices—

“With a view to reducing the amount of duplication of work in preparing the different national nautical and astronomical almanacs and increasing the total data which may be of use to navigators and astronomers available for publication in the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac”—

“That any employee of the Nautical Almanac Office who may be authorized in any annual appropriation bill and whose services in whole or in part can be spared from the duty of preparing for publication the annual volumes of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac may be employed by said office in the duty of improving the tables of the planets, moon, and stars.”

The arrangement thus authorized has been entered into with Great Britain, France, Germany, and Spain. It should be noticed that this arrangement had for its purpose increasing the information available for navigators and astronomers without increasing the expenses of the various national almanac offices. Any cut in the force immediately curtails the work that can be done in improving the tables of the planets, moon, and stars.

Thus to use this international arrangement to economize on the working force, thus reducing the promised results, may be open to the criticism of not living up to our agreement with the foreign national offices.

Moreover, a large part of the data in the Ephemeris can not be computed until that in other parts are finished. Much of the data furnished to the foreign offices by the American office is of this nature and must await the receipt of data apportioned to be furnished from abroad. When these data are received, it is necessary for several months to put the entire present force of this office to work preparing the data to be sent abroad. A reduced force would be unable to prepare the data in time for publication.

Most of the foreign almanacs, as well as our own, obtain their data pertaining to the sun, planets, and stars from the tables prepared in the American Nautical Almanac Office.

The star places, now in use, for the determination of time, longitude, and latitude, are based on observations made 25 and more years ago. An improvement of these places is being demanded by astronomers, by the requirements of the time signals, and by survey work. This work of revision is now being carried on in the Nautical Almanac Office.

It is earnestly urged that the appropriations for the Nautical Almanac Office for the year 1923 be restored to the form in which they were when the bill passed the House.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the committee agree with the Senator from Massachusetts as to the importance of the work done at the Naval Observatory and in the Nautical Almanac Office in the preparation of the American Ephemeris; but upon the most complete information that was submitted to the committee which considered the bill they could not resist the conclusion that there are quite a number of supernumeraries employed in this establishment, which has grown up through a long period of years, some of these places being more or less sinecures. It is perhaps unavoidable that they should be so. When Senators look over the classes of employees, and consider the number of them, and see the reductions that have been made by the committee, it would be difficult, it seems to me, for anyone, even upon the very face of the provision, if he knew what this establishment was, to resist the conclusion that the reductions which have been made here will not interfere in the slightest degree with the conduct of this work.

For instance, the bill provides an astronomer, an assistant astronomer, two other assistant astronomers, an assistant in the department of nautical instruments, a chief clerk at \$2,000, a clerk at \$1,800, another clerk at \$1,600, two clerks at \$1,200, an instrument maker at \$1,500, an electrician at \$1,500, a librarian at \$1,800, a stenographer and typewriter at \$900, a foreman and captain of the watch at \$1,000, a carpenter, an engineer, and a mechanic. Those have not been interfered with at all. All those places have been left just as provided in the

House bill. In addition to those, the House bill carried two clerks at \$1,400 each, three assistants at \$1,600 each, and three at \$1,400 each. The only change that the committee has made is in allowing one clerk instead of two at \$1,400, two assistants instead of three at \$1,600, and two instead of three at \$1,400, reducing the total amount from \$56,400 to \$48,520.

As to the Nautical Almanac, the bill as it came from the House provided for one assistant in preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac at \$2,500, one at \$2,000, two at \$1,800 each, two at \$1,600 each, two at \$1,400 each, and three at \$1,200 each. The committee has left all of those, except that it has provided for one at \$1,400 instead of two, and one at \$1,200 instead of three, making a reduction from \$18,420 to \$14,620. We are informed by competent evidence that the work of preparing the Nautical Almanac and the American Ephemeris can be done just as competently with a reduced force as it can with those carried in the House bill, which is merely a formal matter brought over from the old establishment and the old appropriation from year to year; simply nobody has paid any attention to it or examined whether or not there were more people there than were necessary.

Of course, wherever you undertake to reduce a force you are going to meet with objection; it does not make any difference where it is. The persons who hold those positions will find some one to champion their cause, and, of course, we sympathize with them; but if they are competent men I judge there will be no difficulty in their finding places somewhere else. For instance, where they have four firemen in the Naval Observatory, we reduce them to three. The fireman who loses his job no doubt can be taken care of somewhere else.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator on that particular point that that does not require scientific knowledge, although I think I know something about the value of the work done there. Here are 46 buildings and 62 acres. These four firemen have charge of the heating apparatus, which supplies, I think, 18 buildings, and they do a great deal of other work, plumbing, and so forth, which would have to be done outside if they were not there. For 46 buildings and 62 acres to be covered by 7 watchmen and 4 firemen does not seem to me excessive. I know perfectly well that I could not do it if I had 46 buildings to take care of. The result is that the buildings are not properly taken care of; then more money has to be spent in repairing them and in guarding them.

It seems to me that that is exceedingly moderate for such a large estate as that is; but, of course, that is not vital, I admit. You can go with shabby grounds and buildings out of repair and run the risk of fire and all that if you choose, but the work of the Nautical Almanac and the work of the Naval Observatory is essential, in my judgment, to the proper conduct not merely of the Navy but of all the railroads and all the ships that sail the seas, in which the United States is interested, and to the regulation of the chronometers on which the safety of those ships depends.

I have known a good deal about the observatory in past years. Nobody who is losing a place has been near me, let me say, but I have always taken an interest in the observatory, and I know it has not been a place for sinecures. On the contrary, they are a very hard-worked body of men, who have done a great deal of good work, and the test is in a comparison with Greenwich. With fewer men, they have made more observations and done more work, and I say that to cut down \$12,000 altogether in such an important matter as this is following a mistaken policy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We should not overlook the fact that in addition to the five watchmen who are to be retained under the Senate committee amendment there is a captain of the watch, so that if the Senate committee amendment is adopted we would have a captain of the watch and five watchmen.

Mr. LODGE. It is very difficult to get first-rate men at the Government rates of wages, but if the Senator thinks that the place can be properly guarded with the watchmen and laborers allowed, and that the provision carried in the bill will insure the safety of the buildings and the care of the property, which is of very great value, which cost great sums of money, I am not disposed to dispute his judgment, but I think it most unfortunate to cut down, particularly in the matter of the Nautical Almanac and the American Ephemeris. To make these petty economies in this particular department of the Government does not seem to me to be right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROUSSARD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, which the Secretary will state.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 23, line 10, the committee proposes to strike out “two at \$1,400 each” and insert in lieu thereof “one, \$1,400” and a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I shall not ask for a roll call now, for I want to get the bill through, but when it gets into the Senate, when I hope we shall have a better attendance, I shall ask for a record vote on these reductions.

The next amendment was, on page 23, in line 13, after the word "assistants," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in the same line, before the words "at \$1,400 each," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in line 16, before the word "firemen," to strike out "four" and insert "three"; in the same line, before the word "watchmen," to strike out "seven" and insert "five"; in line 17, before the word "laborers," to strike out "eight" and insert "six"; and in line 18, to strike out "\$56,400" and insert "\$48,520"; so as to make the paragraph read:

Astronomers—one \$3,200, one \$2,800; assistant astronomers—one \$2,400, one \$2,000, one \$1,800; assistant in department of nautical instruments, \$1,600; clerks—chief \$2,000, one \$1,800, one \$1,600, one \$1,400, two at \$1,200 each; instrument maker, \$1,500; electrician, \$1,500; librarian, \$1,800; assistants—two at \$1,600 each, two at \$1,400 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$900; foreman and captain of the watch, \$1,000; carpenter, \$1,000; engineer, \$1,200; three firemen, at \$720 each; five watchmen, at \$720 each; mechanic, \$900; six laborers, at \$660 each; in all, \$48,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Observatory," on page 23, line 21, to strike out "For miscellaneous computations, \$5,000."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on that particular proposition I do wish to make a protest of the strongest kind. It is absolutely cutting down the work of the observatory. It is not getting rid of men; it is cutting off the work of the observatory, work which the observatory is established to do. If we do not have this appropriation for computations, the observations are valueless, and that is what the whole institution exists for. To cut off \$5,000 for miscellaneous computations is simply arresting and stopping the work of the observatory.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the committee is informed that the work can be done by the force available there under the Senate committee amendment, but if it should appear in conference that that is not the case the committee would be very glad to restore it.

Mr. LODGE. I got my figures from the head of the observatory, who is not affected by a single appropriation here, as he is an officer of the Navy, in charge of the observatory. I have talked with no one else, but I know enough about their work to know that cutting off the appropriation for computations is cutting off their right hand. I should like to know who it is who says that the work is not important, and that it can be done without this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALL (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. EDGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. STERLING. Making the same announcement as on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Making the same announcement as on the previous vote with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. ERNST. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD] and vote "yea."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COIT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]; and

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 16, as follows:

| YEAS—33.       |                |             |              |
|----------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Ball           | Frelinghuysen  | Lenroot     | Sterling     |
| Borah          | Gerry          | McKinley    | Sutherland   |
| Cameron        | Glass          | Newberry    | Townsend     |
| Capper         | Harris         | Overman     | Wadsworth    |
| Caraway        | Heflin         | Owen        | Warren       |
| Curtis         | Jones, Wash.   | Phipps      | Watson, Ind. |
| Dillingham     | King           | Polindexter |              |
| Edge           | Ladd           | Smoot       |              |
| Ernst          | LaFollette     | Spencer     |              |
| NAYS—16.       |                |             |              |
| Broussard      | Johnson        | McNary      | Sheppard     |
| Bursum         | Lodge          | Pepper      | Underwood    |
| Dial           | McCormick      | Pomerene    | Walsh, Mass. |
| France         | McCumber       | Ransdell    | Willis       |
| NOT VOTING—47. |                |             |              |
| Ashurst        | Hale           | Nelson      | Shortridge   |
| Brandege       | Harrell        | New         | Simmons      |
| Calder         | Harrison       | Nicholson   | Smith        |
| Colt           | Hitchcock      | Norbeck     | Stanfield    |
| Crow           | Jones, N. Mex. | Norris      | Stanley      |
| Culberson      | Kellogg        | Oddie       | Swanson      |
| Cummins        | Kendrick       | Page        | Trammell     |
| du Pont        | Keyes          | Pittman     | Walsh, Mont. |
| Elkins         | McKellar       | Rowan       | Watson, Ga.  |
| Fernald        | McLean         | Reed        | Weller       |
| Fletcher       | Moses          | Robinson    | Williams     |
| Gooding        | Myers          | Shields     |              |

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for the Naval Observatory, on page 24, line 18, to reduce the appropriation for cleaning, repair, and upkeep of grounds and roads from "\$6,500" to "\$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries, Nautical Almanac Office," on page 24, line 22, after the word "each" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "two at \$1,400 each, three at \$1,200 each," and insert "one \$1,400, one \$1,200," and in line 24 to strike out "\$18,420" and insert "\$14,620," so as to make the paragraph read:

For assistants in preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac—1 \$2,500, 1 \$2,000, 2 at \$1,800 each, 2 at \$1,600 each, 1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,200; assistant messenger, \$720; in all, \$14,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 25, to strike out:

For pay of computers on piecework in preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac and in improving the tables of the planets, moon, and stars, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Engineering," on page 26, line 7, to strike out "\$12,100,000" and insert "\$14,795,000," so as to read:

#### ENGINEERING.

For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats, distilling and refrigerating apparatus; repairs, preservation, and renewals of electric interior and exterior signal communications and all electrical appliances of whatsoever nature on board naval vessels, except range finders, battle order and range transmitters and indicators, and motors and their controlling apparatus used to operate machinery belonging to other bureaus; searchlights and fire-control equipments for antiaircraft defense at shore stations; maintenance and operation of coast signal service; equipment, supplies, and materials under the cognizance of the bureau required for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats; care, custody, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves; purchase, installation, repair, and preservation of machinery, tools, and appliances in navy yards and stations, pay of classified force under the bureau; incidental expenses for naval vessels, navy yards, and stations, inspectors' offices, the engineering experiment station, such as photographing, technical books, and periodicals, stationery, and instruments; instruments and apparatus, supplies, and technical books and periodicals necessary to carry on experimental and research work in radiotelegraphy at the naval radio laboratory; in all, \$14,795,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator having the bill in charge the reason for this great increase over the bill as passed by the House?

Mr. POINDEXTER. This is \$2,000,000 less than was urged by the Secretary of the Navy and Admiral Robison, chief of the Bureau of Engineering. The appropriation covers the maintenance of very valuable and complicated machinery of the entire fleet, also the care of the machinery and the delicate instruments in the ships which may be put out of commission or kept in ordinary under the plan and program laid out by the department in pursuance of the reduction made in the Navy in the limitation of armament treaty. It was con-

sidered by the committee that the increase made here, from the testimony, which was quite voluminous both before the House committee and the Senate committee, was a comparatively small increase, and probably less than the bureau really ought to have. But we made it less than was asked for by the department in the hope and in the belief that the efforts which are being made by Admiral Robison, and which are referred to in the report of the Senate committee, will result in economy and that the cost of supplies and labor may be somewhat reduced and that by cutting down the appropriation considerably below what the department asked, an additional incentive will be furnished for extraordinary economy. With that in view and in order that there might not be an absolute insufficiency of funds to maintain the machinery of the ships and at the same time that there should be an incentive for economy, we compromised with the department by giving the increase which we have provided and at the same time refusing \$2,000,000 requested.

Mr. KING. The explanation of the Senator is very clear and comprehensive, and I express my appreciation of the same, and yet I am not quite clear as to the reason for even the first amount. May I inquire of the Senator if there were any additional facts presented to the Senate committee over those which were presented to the House committee? The Senator stated, as I understood him, that the hearings were very extensive both before the House and Senate committees. I have read some of the hearings. The House went into matters more fully than did the Senate committee. I have no doubt the House committee evidenced just as great a desire to take care of the machinery and property of the Government as did the Senate committee. What reason did they have for limiting the appropriation to \$12,000,000?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There was this difference. In the first place, the Senate committee went more extensively into an examination of the question than did the House committee. There was a great amount of detail testimony from the chief of the bureau and other experts before the Senate committee. But in addition to that is the important circumstance that the figures in the House bill were based upon a Navy of 67,000 men, which was the proposed enlisted strength of the Navy provided in the bill reported to the House. As it passed the House, the House of Representatives increased the personnel 19,000 men, to 86,000, but there was no increase made in the appropriation by the House. There was an expectation there, I may say, if it is not inappropriate, that when the bill came to the Senate corresponding adjustments of the various appropriations for the bureaus to comport with the increase in the personnel would be made. That accounts to a large extent for the increase.

It was estimated by the chief of the bureau and the Secretary of the Navy that if only 67,000 men were allowed they would not be able to keep in commission the same number of ships that they would be able to keep in commission with 86,000 men. They figured that with 67,000 men they could only keep in commission 12 battleships, but with 86,000 men they could keep in commission the entire quota of 18 battleships allowed the United States under the international agreement. They figured they could only keep in commission some 80 destroyers. With 86,000 men they can keep in commission 103 destroyers, and so as to a number of other classes of ships, making a corresponding increase in appropriation for maintenance of machinery of the vessels.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Washington to say that the House increased the personnel of the Navy 19,000 men and yet made no increase whatever in the appropriation for the pay of those added numbers. Did I understand him correctly?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I said that in the item of engineering, and also in other items of the bill, except those of pay and provisions, there were no increases made. My understanding is that it was the expectation of those who were responsible and particularly interested in the bill that the Senate would make increases in the appropriations for the various bureaus, in addition to pay and provisions, to correspond with the increased number of men. The only items increased by the House of Representatives on account of the increase in personnel were the obvious items where an exact calculation could be made as to pay and provisions. Those items have had to be revised by the Senate committee—at least the Senate committee recommends the necessity for revising them—by reason of the change of law as to pay which had been enacted since the House passed the bill. But as to engineering, as to construction and repairs, as to maintenance of yards and docks, as to fuel and transportation, as to maintenance of supplies and accounts, as to ordnance and ordnance stores, and as to transportation and re-

cruiting no increase was made by the House of Representatives on account of the increase made in the number of men.

Mr. KING. The paragraph, beginning on page 25 and ending on page 26, is so confusing that it is impossible for one to read and determine just what branches of the naval service are included within it or just what property is to be cared for and repaired, and just what the expenditures call for are in detail. For instance, it states in line 7:

For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats, distilling and refrigerating apparatus.

The statement of the Senator from Washington would seem to indicate that the greater part of this nearly \$15,000,000 related to the care of delicate machinery which must be taken care of because some of the vessels are withdrawn from commission. Then we find included in this paragraph provision for—

Range finders, battle order and range transmitters and indicators, and motors and their controlling apparatus used to operate machinery belonging to other bureaus; searchlights and fire-control equipments for antiaircraft defense at shore stations; maintenance and operation of coast signal service.

I am not sure whether this is to purchase all these various classes of naval machinery or merely for their repair. Then reference is made to—

Care, custody, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves.

How much is to be devoted to the operation of naval oil reserves? Does that mean that the Government is to begin the development of the naval oil reserves, sink oil wells, construct pipe lines, and conserve the oil? If so, how much of the fourteen or fifteen million dollars is to be devoted to that purpose? There is nothing to indicate that. I do not know what part of the \$15,000,000 is to be devoted to the operation of the naval petroleum reserves. The able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] a few days ago offered a resolution of inquiry and, as I remember, called for information from the Secretary of the Interior relative to one of the naval oil reserves in Wyoming. Is it contemplated that we shall appropriate for the purpose of opening that reserve?

I pause at this point to ask the Senator from Washington if he will kindly advise the Senate what part of the \$15,000,000 is to be devoted to the operation of the naval petroleum reserves referred to in line 21?

Mr. POINDEXTER. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. KING. Can that be used for some other purpose?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It could; but it is allotted and intended to be used for that purpose by the Navy. The appropriation, as the Senator will notice, follows invariably the form of appropriations under this head in being in a lump sum covering the various items which the Senator has mentioned, leaving to the department the segregation and allotment of the funds to the various activities in that bureau.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether it is the custom of the Navy Department, where figures are furnished upon which an appropriation is sought and the appropriation is made, to use the appropriation thus obtained for some other purpose than that for which it was designed by the committee and by the Senate?

Mr. POINDEXTER. My information is that that has not been the custom of the department, although that is sometimes done when an emergency arises. However, the custom of the department is to adhere with considerable strictness to allotment of funds which is set out ordinarily before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KING. Assume that no operations are carried on in the naval petroleum reserve, and that \$100,000 were not expended for that purpose, could that fund be devoted to some other purpose covered in this provision?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Under the law it could be; the law would permit it. It would be subject to the disposition of some proper use, under the language of that paragraph, but not beyond that, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. KING. I understand. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a very improper way of legislating. I can appreciate that if there is a similitude, if I may be permitted that expression, of all of the items in a given paragraph, in case of the failure to devote the entire estimate suggested for a given purpose, it might be used for other items of the same character. For instance, if in a bill \$15,000,000 were appropriated for a battleship and the figures which were submitted to the Committee on Appropriations as the basis of the appropriation called for \$10,000 for a smokestack and \$5,000 for a stairway, and it should be discovered in the prosecution of the work that the staircase was not needed, I can understand that, perhaps, there would be no impropriety in utilizing the \$5,000 for some

other purpose in the construction of the ship; but to take that \$5,000 and use it to buy a motor boat or to acquire land or to buy supplies, would, in my opinion, be highly improper and would subject the department to criticism.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I agree with the Senator, but, taking the illustration suggested by him, it would be impossible to use the money for any one of the other purposes indicated. In this instance the appropriation could not be used for any purpose other than that provided under the heading of the appropriation and specified in the appropriation. For instance, the purchase of land or the purchase of supplies would come under an entirely different bureau and come out of an entirely different fund. None of this money could be used for any such purpose as that.

Mr. KING. Now, let me bring that matter home to the provision under discussion. The committee very wisely—and I will assume that the committee acted wisely because I have such confidence in them—under the evidence adduced felt constrained to add to this bill \$100,000 in a lump sum for the care, custody, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves.

Suppose Secretary of the Navy Denby, acting under information which comes to him and which he did not possess at the time that he or those under him appeared before the committee and solicited the appropriation, concluded that it would be unwise to utilize that \$100,000 for the development of the naval petroleum reserves; I submit that it would be highly improper for Secretary Denby or for any official of the Navy Department to take that \$100,000 and apply it to some other purpose; for instance, the payment of employees who might give their attention to some of the activities that are to be performed under the provisions of this paragraph. I think that it would be unfair; and that is the reason, it seems to me, that these bills are misleading to those who have not before them the estimates of the department. When we ask for the information and are advised that the department estimated \$100,000 for the development of the petroleum reserves, and the committee and the Senate vote for the \$100,000 in the aggregate, with the understanding that it will be utilized for that purpose, I submit that it is improper for it to be applied to some other purpose.

I do not know how we are going to remedy the situation, unless we should add to this bill a proviso that no part of the \$15,000,000 shall be used for any other purpose than that indicated in the specifications submitted by the Navy Department to the committee which became the basis of the aggregate appropriation of \$15,000,000.

I am unwilling to vote, Mr. President, for these shotgun appropriations, be they \$15,000,000 or \$5,000,000, which the committee were induced to put into the bill upon information submitted to them, with the understanding that the Navy Department may, if it wishes, cancel the appropriations with respect to some of the items mentioned and devote the amounts for which they asked to some other purpose within the scope of the paragraph.

I am sure that the able Senator from Washington, who is notoriously so fair and so judicial in his actions, in his conduct, and in his consideration of legislative matters, will agree with me; and I ask him if his committee, before the bill is passed, will not frame an amendment which will deal with this and other provisions of the bill in harmony with the views which I have suggested? If not, I shall ask for further information before I am willing to vote for the appropriation of this large sum.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I feel that the committee will be glad to give thought to the Senator's suggestion. I myself shall do so. I hope, however, that the Senator himself will give additional thought to the matter. His suggestion is a very radical one and would revolutionize the methods of administering the various departments of the Government. If the system which the Senator suggests should be applied to the Navy Department, no doubt it should be applied to all of the other departments.

Mr. KING. Exactly; I agree with the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We would have Congress as a legislative body undertaking to go into details and limiting expenditures in each bureau to a certain amount for every particular activity. Undoubtedly it would result, in many instances, in tying up the department and result in loss to the Government. Whether on the whole, in view of what the Senator has said, the country would lose or benefit by it may be the subject of speculation, but I doubt exceedingly whether it would be wise without an investigation.

If the Senator at some time would propose a complete inquiry into the subject governing the appropriations of Congress, it might serve a very useful purpose, but until such inquiry has been made, the expediency of undertaking to revolutionize the

method of making appropriations while we are in the midst of the consideration of an appropriation bill, upon the floor of the Senate, seems very doubtful.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I appreciate that there is a good deal of merit in what my able friend has said, and yet I want him to view the other side of the shield. We have in this bill appropriations for Bremerton, for Mare Island, for San Diego, and for various other naval bases and stations. How did the committee reach the conclusion that \$250,000 or \$750,000 should go to Mare Island; that \$500,000 or \$600,000 should go to Bremerton; that \$250,000 should go to Norfolk; and that \$225,000 should go to Newport? They did it upon the testimony which was adduced before them, and they exercised their judgment based upon a full investigation. They did not vote for an appropriation of \$225,000 for Newport upon the theory that if the department later concluded to shut up Newport the \$225,000 could be transferred to Bremerton or Mare Island or to any other place. It seems to me that it is too clear for argument that there ought to be some limitation placed upon the power of the Navy Department to make transfers of appropriations thus provided in an omnibus bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the point suggested by the Senator is covered by the bill. It would be impossible where there are specific appropriations such as those he has mentioned to use them for any other purpose. They could not be transferred from the purpose specified in the law.

Mr. KING. Exactly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is true as to the general appropriation for the Bureau of Engineering. The items which go to make up the amount are not segregated in the proposed act; the whole appropriation is confined to engineering and can not be used for any other purpose. Furthermore, there is not a sufficient appropriation, in all probability, according to the testimony before the committee, to serve the actual needs of the Navy unless the utmost economy is exercised.

I may illustrate what the Senator has said about appropriations, for instance, by taking a naval station. If Congress makes an appropriation for Pearl Harbor and specifies that there shall be an extension of a machine shop, we would not go into details and provide how much shall be expended for the brick and how much shall be expended for labor and how much shall be expended for the roofing and the other different materials which enter into the building, and I doubt very much whether it would be wise to undertake to do that.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There must be a point where, in the interest of efficiency, some discretion is left to the executive branch as to the expenditure of the money which is put in their hands, restricted by the general terms of the purpose for which it is appropriated.

Mr. KING. But, to carry out the illustration which the Senator has just given—and absolutely I agree with the Senator so far as he has gone—suppose the Navy Department had come before the Senator's committee and said it was necessary that there should be constructed at Pearl Harbor a house for the officers and a building for the storing of ammunition and a tower for radio purposes, and figured out that \$2,000,000 would be required for the various items presented to the committee; and the committee, instead of stating that \$200,000 should be appropriated for the officers' quarters, \$1,000,000 for the ammunition depot, and so on, had lumped the amount together and fixed the aggregate at \$2,000,000 for the construction of the radio station, the officers' quarters, and the depot, and after the Navy had made further investigations, and before the money had been expended, they concluded that they did not need as large a radio station or as large a depot for ammunition as they had contemplated, and that instead of a million dollars for the depot \$500,000 would be adequate. I deny that they would have the right to take the \$500,000 thus salvaged and apply it to the radio station; and yet that is what could be done under this bill and under the policies and methods heretofore pursued and employed.

Coming back to the paragraph before us, there is a provision—and the Senator has argued to us the importance of it—carrying \$15,000,000. He called our attention to the delicate machinery, the fine armament, and the fact that they must be preserved; and I agree with the Senator. He did not tell us, and I did not know until I read the bill carefully, that part of this \$15,000,000 was for the operation and development of the naval reserves.

If I had not examined the bill carefully, I would have supposed from the Senator's statement—and he made it frankly, and intended to make a full and complete canvass of the situation—that a part of the appropriation was for some other purpose than that indicated by the Senator. My point is that the

Navy Department would not have the right to use for other purposes in the bill that \$100,000 which they had asked for to open up an oil reserve. Is there any intimate relation between the oil reserve in Wyoming or in California and caring for the machinery, so that an appropriation for machinery and for the oil reserve would permit the interchange of the appropriation? Would it be right to use \$100,000 appropriated for the oil reserve for the purpose of building a gun, or to use \$100,000 appropriated for the purpose of building a gun for opening up an oil reserve, simply because both appropriations were stated in a lump sum and carried in the same paragraph?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, I did not undertake, in the general statement which I made of the purpose of this appropriation, to cover every dollar and every particular expenditure. I referred to the importance of maintaining machinery; and I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the estimates which are given us, out of an allowance of \$14,795,000, \$12,061,323 comes under the head of "ship costs"—that is, the maintenance and repair of machinery on ships—so that, I think, substantially supports the statement which I made.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator concedes that they could not use the \$100,000 for the naval oil reserve for the construction of ships?

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the construction of ships? Certainly.

Mr. KING. For the purpose the Senator indicated—that \$12,000,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the maintenance of the machinery of ships?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It could be used if the Secretary of the Navy sanctioned its use for that purpose.

Mr. KING. Though it was appropriated for the development of the oil reserve?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is all appropriated for engineering. It is not appropriated for the development of the oil reserves. If it were appropriated for the development of the oil reserves by the terms of the law, it could not be used for any other purpose. The whole question which the Senator is arguing is whether or not it ought to be appropriated in that way. It never has been appropriated in that way. Of course, if it were, it would have to be used for that purpose.

Mr. KING. Suppose that the Navy Department had not said a word about the operation of the naval oil reserves, and had not asked for a cent of appropriation, would that \$100,000 have gone into this lump sum?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It would not have been taken into account in making up the total.

Mr. KING. It would have carried \$100,000 less, would it not?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very likely it would.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator intends to permit the Navy Department to use \$100,000, if they want to, for a purpose for which it was not designed by the committee, and when they would not have made the appropriation if they had not understood that it would be devoted to the operation of the naval oil reserves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would let this matter go over, and give me a chance, if the Senator does not frame an amendment, to do so; or, if the Senator will consent if I move to reconsider to-morrow in order to offer an amendment, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, if the Senator should desire to do so, I shall have no objection. I should like to get a decision on this amendment.

Mr. KING. With that understanding, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 26, line 13, to strike out "\$1,675,000" and insert "\$2,048,000," so as to make the proviso read:

*Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, shall not exceed \$2,048,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Washington? On line 7, \$14,795,000 was appropriated. The Senator will recall that in other parts of the

bill provisions are made—quite liberal provisions, I think—for clerical help, civil employees, and so forth; yet, out of this \$14,795,000, which ostensibly is for machinery, we allow \$2,048,000 for clerical help, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material. It does seem to me that that sum, \$2,048,000, for clerical help and for messengers and for inspection, is entirely disproportionate to the sum appropriated for the purposes indicated. I ask the Senator if, from the testimony before the committee, he conceives that such a large proportion of the \$14,000,000 should be devoted to that end?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator will observe that that is merely a limitation, that not exceeding that amount shall be used for the purposes which the Senator mentions. The most important element within that limitation is the services of draftsmen for machinery, a very high class of technical skill being required. High-priced men and a considerable number of them are necessary for the maintenance of the machinery in a fleet such as is provided for in this bill—18 battleships, various scout cruisers, and submarines, and auxiliary vessels that go to make up the fleet. The language of this limitation is simply an adoption of the ordinary language of appropriation bills. These matters have grown up from year to year through experience in the departments, and the language is retained in the form which Congress has been accustomed to use in making appropriations.

Mr. KING. Is it contemplated that under this section new machinery will be constructed?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; not new machinery; but it contemplates repairs to old machinery.

Mr. KING. Will draftsmen of the high grade of which the Senator speaks be required for the repair work? The important feature seems to be clerical work.

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the machinery of new vessels under construction the drafting would be paid out of this appropriation, but not for the hulls.

Mr. KING. I have not the testimony before me, and so I am unable to state what it is. I take the word of the Senator. It seems to me, though, that it is a very large appropriation. This seems to be another exhibition of the absolute extravagance of the Navy Department, and if one tried to put his hand upon the many evidences of their extravagance he would be having his fingers extended all the time. This is one paragraph which, in my judgment, shows very great waste and extravagance on the part of the Navy Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Bureau of Construction and Repair," on page 29, line 1, to strike out "\$14,200,000" and insert "\$16,200,000," so as to read:

#### CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF VESSELS.

For preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary; purchase of materials and stores of all kinds; steam steerers, steam capstans, steam windlasses, and all other auxiliaries; labor in navy yards and on foreign stations; purchase of machinery and tools for use in shops; carrying on work of experimental model tank and wind tunnel; designing naval vessels; construction and repair of yard craft, lighters, and barges; wear, tear, and repair of vessels afloat; general care and protection of the Navy in the line of construction and repair; incidental expenses for vessels and navy yards, inspectors' offices, such as photographing, books, professional magazines, plans, stationery, and instruments for drafting room, and for pay of classified force under the bureau; for hemp, wire, iron, and other materials for the manufacture of cordage, anchors, cables, galleys, and chains; specifications for purchase thereof shall be so prepared as shall give fair and free competition; canvas for the manufacture of sails, awnings, hammocks, and other work; interior appliances and tools for manufacturing purposes in navy yards and naval stations; and for the purchase of all other articles of equipment at home and abroad; and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith and manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; naval signals and apparatus, other than electric, namely, signals, lights, lanterns, running lights, and lamps and their appendages for general use on board ship for illuminating purposes; and oil and candles used in connection therewith; bunting and other materials for making and repairing flags of all kinds; for all permanent galley fittings and equipment; rugs, carpets, curtains, and hangings on board naval vessels, \$16,200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Bureau of Ordnance," on page 30, line 21, to strike out "\$9,500,000" and insert "\$10,000,000," so as to read:

#### ORDNANCE AND ORDNANCE STORES.

For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material; for the armament of ships, for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work of the Ordnance Department; for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, and proving grounds; for maintenance of proving grounds, powder factory, torpedo stations, gun factory, ammunition depots, and naval ordnance plants, and for target practice; for the maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled freight and passenger carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval ammunition

depots, naval proving grounds, naval ordnance plants, and naval torpedo stations, and for the pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots; in all, \$10,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 2, to strike out:

That no part of this appropriation or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for expenditure at the Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va., except so much as may be necessary to maintain the station on a closed-down basis.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, this amendment, I think, will provoke some discussion, and I ask the chairman of the committee if he desires to proceed this evening with it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is the purpose of the committee to proceed for a little while longer, and then we expect to move an executive session. I prefer that course. If the Senator is not prepared to go on with this amendment now, I will consent to let it go over.

Mr. FRANCE. It is nearly 6 o'clock now, and—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection to passing over the amendment on the request of the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 32, line 25, to strike out "\$25,893,986," and insert in lieu thereof "pay, \$25,586,102; rental allowance, \$5,712,771; subsistence allowance, \$3,218,643; in all, \$34,517,516."

Mr. KING. I shall move to-morrow to reduce the personnel of the Navy, and it will affect the item under consideration. I have no objection to the amendment being agreed to to-night, if the Senator desires, with the understanding that I may move to reconsider for the purpose of offering my amendment. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand the Senator agrees that we shall proceed with these items, and, of course, if the motion of the Senator from Utah to reduce the personnel should be agreed to, I would be very glad to consent to go back over it again.

Mr. KING. That is what I ask. I want to help the Senator expedite the passage of the bill as far as possible.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 2, after the words "retired list," to strike out "\$3,114,840" and insert "\$3,623,715"; and beginning in line 3 to strike out:

commutation of quarters for officers, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, machinists, pharmacists, pay clerks, and mates, naval constructors, and assistant naval constructors, \$1,310,400; and also members of Nurse Corps (female), \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 11, to strike out the words "or commutation of quarters not to exceed the amount which an officer would receive were he not serving with troops"; on line 17 to strike out "\$675,566" and insert in lieu thereof "\$944,689"; and on line 19 to strike out "\$5,981,900" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,809,675," so as to read:

for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$20,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$944,689; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, \$2,809,675.

Mr. KING. I did not know we had reached the item on lines 17 and 18. May I inquire of the Senator whether the Senate committee had any additional evidence before it which justified it in increasing the item of "\$675,566" to "\$944,689" for pay of enlisted men on the retired list? It seems to me that is a matter as to which there would be no difference. You would base it upon evidence submitted by the department, and the House and Senate ought to reach the same conclusion.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is due to the change made in the law by the pay bill which has just been passed. The calculations are based upon that.

Mr. KING. Would there be a greater number of retired men or would they merely receive a larger sum?

Mr. WARREN. Both.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course the increase in the Navy will result in an increased number of retired enlisted men.

Mr. KING. I comprehend that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 20, after the word "pay" to insert the words "and allowances."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 24, after the word "Corps," to strike out "\$62,108,534" and insert "pay, \$75,356,

780; allowance for lodging and subsistence, \$2,836,050; in all, \$78,192,830."

Mr. KING. The same situation has developed with respect to the item of \$78,192,830 as suggested a moment ago. If my amendment reducing the personnel of the Navy should prevail then a reduction would necessarily have to be made in this item.

Mr. POINDEXTER. On behalf of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment by striking out of the amendment, lines 1 and 2, on page 34, the words "allowance for lodging and subsistence, \$2,836,050; in all, \$78,192,930," for the reason that a mistake was made in putting this item under the head of "Pay of the Navy," the impression being that that was required by the new pay law. As a matter of fact, it should be retained under the head, "Provisions, Navy." It is a mere matter of its proper place in the bill.

Mr. KING. The Senator desires to remove it from this line?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I simply desire to transpose the appropriation of \$2,836,070 from the head "Pay of the Navy" to "Provisions, Navy," and when we reach "Provisions, Navy" I shall offer an amendment to insert the language there. I move to strike out of the amendment of the committee, as printed in the bill, in lines 1 and 2, on page 34, the language "allowance for lodging and subsistence, \$2,836,050; in all, \$78,192,830."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very much gratified that we have made such good progress with the bill to-day, and I think perhaps it would subserve an expeditious conclusion of the bill if we would suspend its consideration at this time until to-morrow morning.

Mr. TRAMMELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 65, line 14, after the word "purposes," insert the following:

That any officer of the Navy who has served four years as chief of a bureau in the Navy Department and shall be retired subsequent to the completion of such period of service for physical disability due to wounds inflicted by the enemy while in the performance of his duty shall be retired with the rank, pay, and allowances now authorized by law for the retirement of a chief of bureau."

#### DECISIONS OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I deplore the tendency of the times to criticize public men and public institutions in our country. It seems that our people—a great many of them, at least—have almost gone mad in trying to find fault with somebody.

A great deal of propaganda has gone out abusing the South for employing children in cotton mills. I do not propose to take up more than a moment or two of the Senate's time, but I expect to make a few remarks on this subject within a few days. This is done either intentionally, with a view of trying to injure our section and to injure the business of manufacturing, or it is done ignorantly. I notice in the papers almost every day some misrepresentations about this occupation. They are entirely unjustified and unfounded. I believe that there are child-labor laws in 46 States of the Union. We have stringent laws on the subject in my State, and no child under 14 years of age has worked in a cotton mill there for a number of years. The progress that we are making in that section is phenomenal. The improvements in education and in refinement and in living conditions are unsurpassed in any part of our Union. However, well-meaning people, I take it, or perhaps some fanatics, or members of this so-called "uplift" crowd who ought to be at work, are going around trying to disturb the public mind and trying to create dissatisfaction between employer and employee.

I have no patience whatever with any such procedure; and, as I say, it is unfounded in our part of the country, and absolutely unjustified. I deplore to see in an afternoon paper that a member of the Cabinet paid his respects to the Congress in no complimentary terms. I also deplore to see in the morning paper that a Member of Congress has so far forgotten himself as to abuse the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I take it that the Supreme Court needs no defense at my hands; but I say if there is one institution in the United States that we ought to be proud of, it is the Supreme Court.

All the recent criticism of that court has been unfounded, uncalled for, and out of place; and if there is anything that we desire more than another, it is a perpetuation of the Constitution of the United States and of the Supreme Court. I only wish that other bodies besides the Supreme Court would act in as just a manner as they do, and in as courageous a manner.

It is startling, it is terrifying, to see the tendency of legislative bodies to follow the popular whim, whether it be right or be wrong.

Mr. President, I do hope that Congress at least will keep its equilibrium, and not run off at a tangent, following these false notions. It is time that we were calling a halt, and I hope that these matters will not receive serious attention. They should not even be introduced into this body.

I shall have more to say later; but I say that the Supreme Court of the United States and, in fact, all the courts in the United States enjoy and have enjoyed the confidence and the respect and the esteem of the people of this country. Even during the Civil War the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States were unanimously respected and looked up to. So it is out of place, it is in poor taste, to criticize them now; and I feel that these criticisms come from people who are trying to disrupt our Government. Very recently the court has made some important decisions. I do not suppose that any first-class lawyer in the United States would question the soundness and the wisdom of those decisions; and I say that if there is one temporal thing more than another that we ought to pray for, it is the perpetuation of the Constitution of the United States and of the courts.

## ORDER FOR RECESS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its business to-day it shall take a recess until to-morrow at 11 a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## OFFICE OF RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BALL submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That a commission is hereby created, consisting of three Members of the Senate, appointed by the Vice President, and three Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker, to investigate the needs of the office of the recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia, and to report not later than December 20, 1922, (1) what quarters, equipment, and facilities are necessary properly to care for and protect all records and papers in such office, and (2) what additional personnel, if any, is required to perform the duties imposed by law upon such office.

## PROCTER &amp; GAMBLE CO.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in his remarks yesterday the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] referred to the Procter & Gamble Co., of my State, as being interested in legislation relative to feedstuffs. I thought at the time he was mistaken. I have since ascertained that he was mistaken. I ask permission to have printed in the Record a telegram which I send to the desk stating the facts.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 14, 1922.

HON. FRANK B. WILLIS,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Our attention called to press dispatch of Senator BROUSSARD in reference to tariff on blackstrap molasses. This company is not interested, and has taken no part whatever in connection with tariff legislation on this item.

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE CO.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, June 16, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## NOMINATIONS.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

The following-named persons for promotion in the Consular Service of the United States from interpreter at \$3,000 to consul of class 6, as follows:

Jay C. Huston, of California.  
Norwood F. Allman, of Louisiana.  
From vice consul de carriere of class 1 to consul of class 7:  
H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona.  
Joseph F. McGurk, of New Jersey.  
Charles J. Pizar, of Wisconsin.  
Louis H. Gourley, of Illinois.  
James J. Murphy, jr., of Pennsylvania.  
George Wadsworth, of New York.

Orsen N. Neilsen, of Wisconsin.  
Walter A. Adams, of South Carolina.  
William W. Heard, of Maryland.  
George A. Makinson, of California.  
John L. Bouchal, of Nebraska.  
Lynn W. Franklin, of Maryland.  
George L. Brandt, of the District of Columbia.  
S. Bertrand Jacobson, of New York.  
Robert F. Fernald, of Maine.  
Flo C. Funk, of Colorado.  
V. Winthrop O'Hara, of Kansas.  
H. Earle Russell, of Michigan.  
William P. George, of Alabama.  
Samuel B. Thompson, of California.  
George T. Colman, of New York.  
From interpreter at \$3,000 to consul of class 7:  
Dillard B. Lasseter, of Georgia.  
Harvey T. Goodier, of New York.

## APPOINTMENT IN THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

Philip Adams, of Massachusetts, to be a consul of class 7 of the United States of America.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

William H. Barrett, of Georgia, to be United States district judge, southern district of Georgia, vice Beverly D. Evans, deceased.

## APPOINTMENT IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Arthur Watts Skilling, of Massachusetts, to be aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, vice F. E. Joekel, resigned.

## APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

## SIGNAL CORPS.

First Lieut. Harrison William Johnson, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of April 20), 1922.*

## SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

J. Howard Reed to be surveyor of customs, district No. 11, Philadelphia, Pa.

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Joseph L. Crupper to be collector of customs, district No. 14, Norfolk, Va.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Ralph L. Lawrence to be assistant surgeon.  
Edwin C. Sorenson to be assistant surgeon.

## POSTMASTERS.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Lena L. Diehl, Dunn Center.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Ida A. Calhoun, Clemson College.  
Jean C. Sloan, Pendleton.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 15, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we bow at Thy footstool in the name of Him who was wounded for our transgressions. We will say of Thee, Thou art our refuge and strength; and with gratitude our hearts proclaim it. Let all the people praise Thee, O Lord. Preserve them from the perils of exaggerated and malicious speech. May our fellow countrymen move forward with constant pride and enthusiastic passion for the tenets of our great Government. Everywhere increase reverence for law and for those fundamentals established by our forefathers. In the questions of the day enable us to be wise, prudent, and reflective. Give us confidence in Thy truth, and help us to build upon the rock that can not be shaken. In the name of Jesus, our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.